OPERATORIC RESEARCH CORPUS - STUDIES IN WORLD-FORMATION

VOL 3

Time, Recurrence and World-Binding - Eigenzeit in Physics and Consciousness

Timothy Speed

Operatoric Research Corpus
Studies in World-Formation

Section I

Ontology and Physics

Volume 3

Time, Recurrence and World-Binding – Eigenzeit in Physics and Consciousness

Timothy Speed

2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18983591

Impressum / Publication Information

Author: Timothy Speed
Independent Researcher
Straße zur Eiche 10
04916 Schönewalde
Germany

Email: info@timothy-speed.com
Website: https://timothy-speed.org

License:
© 2026 — CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

GND: 122901991

VIAF: 37811735

ISNI: 000000001636722X

Wikidata: Q138504206

Scholar ID: hBLHdoAAAAJ

https://orcid.org/0009-0002-0143-5949

Zenodo Community: Operatoric Research Corpus Archive

First published: 2026

This publication is deposited in the German National Library (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) as a network publication.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18983591

Time, Recurrence and World-Binding – Eigenzeit in Physics and Consciousness

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18983591

Abstract

The present volume brings together four contributions that pursue a common ontological question: under what conditions can determinate reality arise from an open dynamics of possibilities, and when does this transition take the form of observation or experience.

The point of departure is the diagnosis that central problems of modern physics and consciousness research—most notably the measurement problem of quantum mechanics and the so-called "hard problem" of consciousness—rest on a categorial confusion. Transitions between openness and facticity are typically interpreted as processes that must be mediated within a shared temporal framework. The contributions collected here argue, by contrast, that this expectation itself forms part of the difficulty. Where implicative boundary acts are involved, the question of a mediating "how" loses its validity.

From this perspective, the measurement problem is reread. Measurement no longer appears primarily as an epistemic act performed by an observer, but as an ontological stabilization of determinacy under conditions of structural overload within open dynamics. Observation, in this sense, is not a special property of particular systems, but a space-internal operation through which world stabilizes events and perspectives.

Against this background, the volume develops the concept of **ontological recurrence** within the MNO model (Submergence–Indimergence–Emergence), originally introduced in *The Physics of the Poor*. Recurrence designates a cyclical return of a system to the space of its own possibilities prior to the stabilization of an actual state. The central proposal is that the transition from possibility to actuality can occur in two structurally distinct forms: as ordinary measurement without recurrence, or as phenomenal actualization under conditions of recurrence.

This distinction makes it possible to treat the measurement problem of quantum mechanics and the emergence of conscious experience within a shared structural framework. At the same time, it suggests a minimal dynamical condition under which physical collapse events—such as those discussed in Orch-OR models—can acquire phenomenal quality.

The volume therefore does not present itself as a new interpretation of quantum mechanics in the narrow sense. Its aim is rather a categorial clarification of the conditions under which concepts such as measurement, observer, experience, and time can be meaningfully formulated and related to one another.

Keywords: quantum measurement problem; philosophy of physics; consciousness studies; hard problem of consciousness; quantum collapse; Orch-OR theory; observer problem in quantum mechanics; ontological recurrence; MNO model; Eigenzeit; world-formation; possibility and actuality.

Contents

Time, Recurrence and World-Binding – Eigenzeit in Physics and Consciousness 3

Why the Question of "How" Is Wrong Implication, Temporal Seduction, and the Categorical Boundary Between Recurrence and Indimergence 6

Measurement Without an Observer On the Spatial Stabilization of Determinacy in the MNO Model 12

MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience *(reprinted article – original pagination preserved)* 16

Orch-OR with Recurrence: A Minimal Dynamical Condition for When Objective Reductions Yield Conscious Experience 56

About the Author 63

References 64

Introduction

Modern physics possesses an extraordinarily successful mathematical description of nature. At the same time, however, questions persist in its foundations that have not been stably resolved despite intensive theoretical work. This becomes particularly evident in the so-called measurement problem of quantum mechanics. Although the formal equations of the theory describe with precision how physical states evolve, it remains unclear under what conditions a determinate outcome arises from an open state description.

A related problem appears in consciousness research. Here too numerous models exist that describe neural, informational, or functional correlates of experience. Yet it remains unresolved under what conditions physical processes can take the form of a subjective perspective at all. The well-known formulation of this issue as the "hard problem" of consciousness already indicates that a categorial difficulty is involved, one that cannot be resolved by additional empirical data alone.

The contributions collected in this volume proceed from the assumption that both fields of problems share a common structural source. In both cases, a transition is addressed that is usually interpreted as a process: the transition from an open dynamics of possible states to a determinate actuality. This interpretation leads to the search for a mediating mechanism that would explain, within a shared temporal framework, how openness becomes facticity.

The contributions assembled here propose to make this expectation itself the object of analysis. They argue that part of the difficulty arises from the tacit assumption that transitions between possibility and actuality must necessarily be describable as temporal processes. Where categorial boundary acts are involved, however, the question of a mediating "how" loses its validity. Instead of searching for additional mechanisms, the task becomes a clarification of the ontological conditions under which concepts such as measurement, observation, or experience can be meaningfully employed at all.

Against this background, the measurement problem of quantum mechanics is reread. Measurement no longer appears primarily as an epistemic act of an observer, but as a form of stabilization of determinacy within an open dynamic. In this perspective, the observer is neither an additional entity nor a privileged physical system. Observation designates rather a space-internal operation through which world forms local perspectives and stable events under conditions of structural overload.

From this reformulation a closer connection emerges between the question of measurement and the question of consciousness. Both concern transitions between possibility and actuality, yet they differ in the structural conditions under which these transitions occur. The volume develops for this purpose the concept of **ontological recurrence** within the MNO model (Submergence–Indimergence–Emergence). Recurrence designates a cyclical return of a system to the space of its own possibilities before an actualization takes place.

Recurrence does not refer to a return into an unrestricted possibility space. The field of possibilities is already structurally curved by prior acts of world-binding. (Section III /Vol 6 /Eigenzeit und Section II / Vol 5 / The End of Wold-Time)

The central proposal is that physical actualization can occur in two structurally different forms. If state reduction occurs without such a return to the space of possibilities, it appears as an ordinary measurement. If it occurs under conditions of ontological recurrence, a phenomenal actualization arises — what from the interior perspective appears as experience.

The contributions of this volume develop these considerations in several steps. A first text examines the methodological question of why many debates in physics and ontology tend to translate categorial boundary acts into descriptions of processes. A second contribution develops an alternative reading of the measurement problem in which measurement is understood as a spatial stabilization of determinacy. Building on this, the central paper of the volume formalizes the concept of ontological recurrence within the MNO model and connects it with questions of observation, agency, and phenomenal experience. A final contribution discusses how this structure may be interpreted within physical models such as Orch-OR as a minimal dynamical condition for phenomenal collapse events.

The volume therefore does not pursue a reductionist program and does not propose a new physical dynamics. Its aim is rather a categorial clarification of the conditions under which concepts such as measurement, observer, experience, and time can meaningfully be related to one another. In this sense, the perspective developed here should be understood less as a new interpretation of quantum mechanics in the narrow sense than as a contribution to an ontological reconstruction of the structure within which physical and phenomenal actuality can appear.

Why the Question of "How" Is Wrong Implication, Temporal Seduction, and the Categorical Boundary Between Recurrence and Indimergence

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18390249

Abstract

This paper does not begin with a new theory, but with a false question.
In physics, consciousness research, and ontology, there is a persistent tendency to read categorical boundary acts as processes and, wherever implication is at stake, to ask for temporal mediation. This tendency is not a methodological accident, but the expression of a deeper epistemic seduction: the attempt to deploy time as a universal binding agent of thought.

Starting from the All–Nothing Paradox, it is shown that implication neither mediates, nor coordinates, nor relates. It does not constitute a transition between states, but marks the point at which concepts of process, time, and relation lose their validity. Terms such as "in between," "simultaneous," or "transition" prove in this context not to be imprecise, but categorically wrong.

As a concrete anchor, the paper employs the distinction between recurrence and indimergence within an operator-based research program. Recurrence designates a structurally describable, cyclical organization of openness that can be formulated temporally. Indimergence, by contrast, is not an event within the cycle, not a phase, and not a boundary process, but a non-processual act of facticization. The recurring question of how the two "come together" is therefore not answered, but identified as a symptom of a post-indimergent error of thought.

The paper argues that many unresolved debates—from the measurement problem in quantum mechanics to the emergence of consciousness—do not fail due to a lack of theory, but due to the unreflected introduction of temporal mediation where only logical distinguishability is at stake. The aim is not a new explanation, but a disciplining of questioning: where implication is operative, the jurisdiction of the "how" comes to an end.

Methodological Remark

The terms used in this paper are not newly introduced or explicitly defined, but are presupposed as part of an existing operator-based framework. The aim is not terminological explication, but a determination of the boundary conditions under which these terms may be read. Where explanation is expected, the wrong question has already been posed.

This paper should be read as a methodological boundary text within a broader operator-based research program.
It does not introduce new concepts, but fixes the conditions under which existing ones—such as indimergence and recurrence—may be read without being falsely translated into processual or temporal terms.

I. The False Question

One of the most stable habits of thought is to ask *how* something happens where what is required is not explanation but delimitation. Where concepts do not interlock, an "in-between" is sought. Where no mediation is given, one is assumed. Time functions here as a universal solvent: wherever a rupture irritates, a sequence is introduced.

This gesture has become so self-evident that it is scarcely recognized as a problem at all. It appears as methodological integrity, as an expression of thoroughness, as a necessary step of rational explanation. In fact, however, it is an epistemic seduction: the introduction of time precisely where time itself is what is at stake.

The error does not lie in the imprecision of the concepts, but in the form of the question itself. "How does A get to B?" already presupposes that A and B stand within a shared temporal frame, that there is a mediating interval, and that this interval is in principle describable. Where these presuppositions are not met, the question is not open, but illegitimate.

Particularly persistent in this regard is the appeal to simultaneity. It seems to defuse the problem by dispensing with succession. Yet simultaneity is not the suspension of time, but one of its forms. It presupposes comparability, a stable frame within which something can be simultaneous at all. As such, it already belongs to the order that is here only coming into question.

What is at issue, therefore, is not a missing transition, but the false expectation of a transition. It is not mediation that remains unexplained, but the demand for mediation itself that constitutes the error.

II. Implication Instead of Mediation

Implication does not designate a relation between separated terms. It connects nothing, coordinates nothing, bridges nothing. Implication is not a relation within an order, but the condition under which orders can appear as distinguishable at all.

The All–Nothing Paradox marks precisely this point. It does not describe a dialectical movement, a reversal, or a process. Rather, it shows that openness and facticity cannot be brought into relation without already committing the error it makes visible. The paradox is not a transition, but a logical standstill: a point at which relationality itself is suspended.

For this very reason, it generates a systematic pull toward dynamization. Where no transition can be described, one is imagined. Where time does not apply, it is introduced. This reflex is

not accidental, but the expression of a mode of thought that can endure boundary acts only as boundary processes.

Implication is, in this sense, not a particularly fast process, not an infinitesimal moment, and not an idealized limiting case. It is not a process at all. Any temporal characterization—whether as duration, instant, or simultaneity—already presupposes what can here arise only as an effect.

Implication therefore does not remain without consequences. It is not an event in the world, but neither is it an empty break. What follows from it is not mediation, but world-formation. Only where facticity has already been set can an ontological order take shape: cycles, phases, stabilizations, feedbacks. This order does not describe implication itself, but the manner in which world organizes itself after this boundary has been drawn.

The sphere cycle—submergence, indimergence, emergence—is in this sense not a model of implication, but a model of subsequent rounding. It describes how world stabilizes, differentiates, and flattens again after the categorical boundary has already been drawn. The cyclical structure belongs to the ontology of the world, not to the conditions of its possibility.

The persistent temptation to slide implication and sphere cycle into one another rests on a projection backwards: the ontological description of world-formation is applied to the boundary act that first makes this description possible. It is precisely this backward projection that must be rejected here. Implication does not explain how world comes into being. It explains why world can come into being at all.

III. Recurrence and Indimergence

The distinction between recurrence and indimergence serves as a precise test case for the error of thought criticized here. It makes visible how quickly categorical differences are folded back into processual narratives.

In this context, the term *recurrence* is to be read deliberately in a structural sense. It does not denote a physical, neurobiological, or informational dynamic in the narrow meaning of the term, even where it is compatible with models of recursive stabilization or rhythmic coherence. What is meant is not a cause, not a mechanism, and not an ontic process, but a describable organizational form of openness.

Recurrence designates a structurally formulable organization of openness. It is describable as cyclical, rhythmic, recurrent. Within it, patterns, feedbacks, and stabilizations can be identified without already presupposing facticity. In this sense, recurrence is temporally formulable without being time-constitutive.

Indimergence, by contrast, is not an element of this cycle. It is neither its culmination nor its tipping phase. It is not an event in the course of recurrence, but the boundary act at which the jurisdiction of cyclical description comes to an end. Indimergence designates the non-processual enforcement of facticity. It does not occur in time, but marks the condition under which time can acquire meaning as a directed magnitude at all.

The widespread question of how recurrence and indimergence "come together" is therefore not unanswered, but wrongly posed. It presupposes that both operate on the same level and would

have to be coordinated by a mediating step. It is precisely this presupposition that is rejected by the distinction itself.

IV. Consequences

If implication is taken seriously as a boundary act, entire classes of questions lose their status. They are not open, not difficult, not yet to be answered—they are wrongly posed. This applies not only locally to the distinction discussed here, but systematically to central debates in physics, consciousness research, and ontology.

1. The Measurement Problem and Collapse

The so-called measurement problem of quantum mechanics appears unsolvable as long as collapse is understood as a dynamical transition. Wherever a physical mechanism is sought that converts superposition into objectivity, it is already presupposed that openness and facticity can be mediated within a shared temporal framework. It is precisely this presupposition that must be rejected here.

Indimergence does not designate a collapse process, but the categorical endpoint of the process question itself. That the transition cannot be described is not a deficit of the theory, but an indication that a boundary condition is being touched here. The desire for dynamization is not an advance in knowledge, but an expression of the same temporal seduction already identified in Section II.

2. Emergence and Consciousness

A similar point applies to models of the emergence of consciousness. As long as the question is posed of how subjective experience arises from objective processes, consciousness is treated as the late product of a temporal chain. Yet this chain already presupposes a world in which objectivity is stabilized and processes can be described.

The distinction proposed here shifts the focus. Consciousness does not arise *from* world-processes, but is bound to those boundary acts through which world appears at all as a structured order. The sphere cycle describes the ontological organization of this world, not the origin of the boundary itself. Consciousness, in this sense, is not an emergent add-on, but part of subsequent world-formation.

3. Time and Explanation

The consequence is not a renunciation of explanation, but a clarification of what can be explained. Processes, cycles, dynamics, and feedbacks are legitimate—but only where their presuppositions already hold. Where these presuppositions themselves are placed in question, the jurisdiction of processual concepts comes to an end.

Within this framework, time is not a neutral medium, but an effect of boundary-drawing. It cannot be deployed as a universal mediator without blurring precisely the boundary at which it first acquires meaning. The demand for temporal explanation here is not an expression of depth, but of categorical impatience.

4. Disciplining the Questioning

The aim of this paper is therefore not a new model and not an alternative dynamics. It consists in a disciplining of questioning. Where implication is operative, the question of *how* is misplaced. It replaces boundary thinking with narrative and produces pseudo-problems where boundaries ought to be marked.

Indimergence and recurrence do not function here as competing concepts, but as markers of two distinct levels. Whoever collapses them into one another loses both: the sharpness of the boundary and the describability of the world. To hold fast to this distinction is not a matter of terminological pedantry, but an epistemic necessity.

References:

This work operates operatorically rather than discursively; its claims are derived from internal structural invariance rather than from literature synthesis.

Speed, T. (2026). Why the Measurement Problem Is Not Dynamically Solvable - A Boundary Determination with Respect to Collapse Models, Many-Worlds, and Information-Based Ontologies (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18379725

Speed, T. (2026). Without a Path: Why Quantum Mechanics and Relativity Imply Each Other Without Mediation (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18375589

Speed, T. (2026). Wave Function Collapse Is Not a Dynamical Process - On the Irreversible Constriction of Possibility, Time, and Objectivity (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18366599

Speed, T (2016/2025): The Physics of the Poor: A Neurodivergent Meta-Theory of Consciousness ISBN: 3695191287

Speed, T. (2016). The Physics of the Poor - A Neurodivergent Meta-Theory of Consciousness (AAM Open Version English) [Computer software]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18175692

Speed, T. (2025). MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17913823

Speed, T. (2025). Orch-OR with Recurrence: A Minimal Dynamical Condition for When Objective Reductions Yield Conscious Experience (1 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17942531

Speed, T. (2025). Black Holes as a Boundary Case for Emergence - An MNO-based Clarification of the Ontological Boundary of Physical World-Capability (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17974647

Speed, T. (2025). The All–Nothing Paradox - Ontological Openness as a Condition of World-Formation - Why Closure – Not Complexity – Marks the Limit of Artificial Systems (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18000820

Speed, T. (2025). The Constructed Observer - World-Formation Beyond Representation - Why Perception Is Not Representation, but a Structural Achievement (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18006170

Speed, T. (2025). Dark Energy as an Emergent Residuum - A Minimal Operator-Based Interpretation within an MNO Framework (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015172

Speed, T. (2025). The Gap as a Condition - Pre-Ontological Operatorics and the Primacy of Response (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015885

Speed, T. (2025). From Objects to Responses - On the Loss of Ontological Sovereignty in Contemporary Physics (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18017629

Speed, T. (2025). The Observer as a Spatial Category - On the Topological Inversion of World and the Ontological Structure of Observation (4 English DOI corrected in PDF). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18018699

Speed, T. (2025). Measurement Without an Observer - On the Spatial Stabilization of Determinacy in the MNO Model (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18020588

Speed, T. (2025). Information Without World - On the Limits of Additive Information Theories in Physics (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18045445

Speed, T. (2025). Renormalization as a Boundary Operation in the Quantum Field Theory of the Standard Model (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18060365

Speed, T. (2025). Vacuum Energy as a Residual Quantity - On the Cosmological Constant as a Boundary Phenomenon of Physical Stabilization (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18061827

Speed, T. (2025). Why Time Is Directed: World Stabilization as an Ontological Condition (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18096277

Speed, T. (2025). The Curve of the World - Why World-Binding Cannot Be Linear — Shift of Being, Time, and the Impossibility of the Archive (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18097931

Speed, T. (2026). Time Difference Without Neutralization - An Ontological Supplement to Relativity Theory (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18115940

Speed, T. (2026). Stabilization Without World - On the Self-Distortion of Physics Through Statistical Placeholders (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18267243

Measurement Without an Observer
On the Spatial Stabilization of Determinacy in the MNO Model

DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.18020588**

Abstract

The so-called measurement problem of quantum mechanics is usually formulated as an epistemic problem: how does a determinate measurement outcome arise from a formally open state description? The prevailing answers either operate with additional entities (collapse, many worlds, consciousness, information) or with perspectival relativizations, without categorially clarifying the status of measurement itself.

The present text proposes a different reading. Building on the MNO model of ontological recurrence and the determination of the observer as a spatial category, it is argued that the measurement problem is not a problem of knowledge, but a spatial–ontological boundary phenomenon. Measurement does not denote the access of an observer to a system, but an enforced stabilization of determinacy at the point where open physical dynamics are structurally no longer integrable.

Within this framework, determinacy does not appear as the result of cognition, but as the minimal form of world under conditions of ontological overload. The measurement problem thus does not disappear through a new interpretation, but through the abandonment of a false categorial presupposition: the assumption that observation is primarily an epistemic event.

This paper stands in relation to:

Speed, T. (2025). The Observer as a Spatial Category - On the Topological Inversion of World and the Ontological Structure of Observation (4 English DOI corrected in PDF). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18018699

Speed, T. (2025). The Gap as a Condition - Pre-Ontological Operatorics and the Primacy of Response (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015885

Speed, T. (2025). Seinsverschiebung (Shift of Being) as a Pre-Ontological Category - On the Incompatibility of Existence and Understanding in Modern Regimes of Stabilization (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18007628

Speed, T. (2025). Artificial Systems Without World - Why World-Formation and Technical Usability Are Structurally Incompatible - Ontological Limits of Artificial Intelligence in Light of ANP, MNO, and Observer Structure (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18006914

Speed, T. (2025). The Constructed Observer - World-Formation Beyond Representation - Why Perception Is Not Representation, but a Structural Achievement (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18006170

Speed, T. (2025). MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17913823

Speed, T. (2025). Dark Energy as an Emergent Residuum - A Minimal Operator-Based Interpretation within an MNO Framework (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015172

1. The Measurement Problem as a Categorial Misunderstanding

In its classical form, the measurement problem asks how a single, determinate measurement outcome can arise from a superposition of determinate states. This question already implies a problematic assumption: that measurement is a special act, distinct from the rest of physical dynamics, and therefore requires an additional explanation.

Regardless of the interpretation chosen, this assumption remains in place. Either a collapse is postulated, a branching of the world is assumed, or the relativity of states is emphasized. In all cases, the problem is formulated epistemically: as a question of who knows or observes what, and when.

The present approach intervenes at an earlier point. It does not ask how knowledge arises, but why a situation arises at all in which determinacy becomes necessary.

2. MNO: Recurrence Instead of a Special Event

Within the MNO model, reality is not a continuously updated state, but passes through cyclical phases of openness, condensation, and renewed emergence. Stability is not a default condition, but a local result of limited capacity to sustain openness.

In this model, measurement does not appear as an external intervention, but as a point of enforced stabilization within a general ontological cycle. It is not a special event, but a boundary case: the moment at which open dynamics can no longer be sustained and must be transferred into a stable form.

3. The Observer as a Spatial Response

Decisive here is the redefinition of the observer. The observer is not an entity, not a subject, and not a physical system, but a space-internal operation: a local folding of world that gives rise to perspective and eventhood.

In this sense, a measurement outcome is not the result of an observation, but the result of a spatial response to non-integrability. Where physical openness can no longer be coherently maintained, space forms a zone of perspectival stability. This zone is what classically appears as the "observer."

Determinacy is thus not an epistemic achievement, but an ontologically minimal solution under strain.

4. Measurement as Spatial Stabilization

In this reading, measurement is not a transition from ignorance to knowledge, but a transition from unsustainable openness to local stability. The measurement outcome is not a collapse of a state, but the form in which world can persist under constraint.

The question "Why this outcome?" is therefore not answered causally, but is reconfigured categorially. It does not ask for a hidden dynamics, but marks the point at which further openness is structurally excluded.

5. Consequences for the Measurement Problem

From this perspective, the measurement problem loses its paradoxical character. It does not disappear because a new interpretation is offered, but because the underlying assumption is abandoned that measurement is primarily an epistemic act.

Measurement is:

- not an act of access,
- not an information update,
- not an event of consciousness,

but a spatial stabilization of determinacy under conditions of ontological non-integrability.

6. Conclusion

The present approach does not compete with decoherence theories or with formal quantum mechanics; rather, it addresses the categorial precondition under which concepts such as decoherence, event, and probability become meaningful at all.

This approach does not solve the measurement problem in a technical sense. It shifts it to a level at which its paradoxical form is no longer meaningful. Where observation is no longer

understood as an epistemic event, but as a spatial response to overload, the question of "collapse" loses its sense.

Measurement is not an exception within physics.
It is the point at which world is forced to take form.

MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience *(reprinted article – original pagination preserved)*

Editorial Note

The following text is reproduced from a previously published paper and is included here as an integral contribution to this volume.
For reasons of citation consistency and archival traceability, the original pagination of the article has been retained.
The page numbers appearing in the following section therefore correspond to the original publication and do not follow the continuous pagination of the present volume.

Speed, T. (2025). MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience (Version 1). Zenodo.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17913823

MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience

Timothy Speed
Independent Researcher
info@timothy-speed.com https://timothy-speed.org ORCID: 0009-0002-0143-5949

© 2025 Timothy Speed — CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Abstract

This paper proposes a structural bridge between the quantum measurement problem and the hard problem of consciousness. It introduces *MNO* (Submergence–Indimergence–Emergence) as an operator-level description of how definite outcomes arise: openness of possibilities, tension toward form, and forced actualisation. The core claim is an identity-style constraint: collapse is not phenomenally relevant unless it is preceded by a *recurrent return* to the space of possibilities from which the outcome is selected. Externally, this recurrence appears as measurement/actualisation; internally, it is the lived aspect of the same return movement. We distinguish quantum *superposition* (a physical state in Hilbert space) from an *ontological possibility space* (the precondition of differentiability), and argue that conflating them obscures both observerhood and experience. The framework yields operational hypotheses (e.g., transitions across sleep, anesthesia, dissociation, and lucid/meditative clarity should track changes in recurrence dynamics, not only coherence), and clarifies the role of observers in thought experiments such as Schrödinger's cat and Wigner's friend.

1 Introduction

The measurement problem in quantum mechanics and the "hard problem" of consciousness share a surprising structural feature: both require a transition from a formally described set of possibilities to a single, actual outcome.

In quantum theory, this transition is expressed by state-vector reduction; in phenomenology, by the emergence of a definite, first-person perspective.

Neither domain currently provides a principled account of *why* or *when* this transition occurs, nor what unifies these two manifestations of actualisation.

A dominant intuition across physics and philosophy is that collapse and consciousness are distinct problems with distinct mechanisms.

In this paper, we argue that they are two expressions of a single underlying structure. We develop a framework—the MNO model—that defines an ontological condition we call *ontological recurrence*. Collapse, measurement, and conscious experience occur only when this condition is met.

The central proposal of this paper is simple:

> **Quantum collapse must be preceded by a recurrent return to the space of ontological possibilities. When this recurrence is absent, collapse yields a measurement; when it is present, collapse yields conscious experience.**

This distinction provides a criterion that has been missing in quantum foundations and consciousness studies alike.

Current models of collapse (GRW, CSL, decoherence, and Orch-OR) specify *how* a physical state reduces, but not *why* reduction should correspond to the emergence of an observing standpoint.

Similarly, theories of consciousness (IIT, GNW, HOT, predictive processing) describe structural or computational correlates of experience, without identifying the fundamental ontological condition that makes experience possible.

The MNO framework proposes that both problems hinge on the same structural operation: a system that not only undergoes physical evolution but also

recurs to the set of its quantum-permissible successor states before actualising one of them.

This recurrence is not computation, representation, or modelling.

It is a pre-physical relation to the system's own possibility-space:

an ontological openness that precedes any specific state.

When collapse occurs without this recurrence, the result is an ordinary quantum event—a measurement.

When collapse occurs with recurrence, the result is the interior perspective we call consciousness.

The goal of this paper is to formalise this claim, show how it resolves both the measurement problem and the hard problem, and derive experimentally testable predictions.

We remain neutral with respect to physical substrate: the framework applies to neural systems, quantum systems, and hybrid models such as Orch-OR.

Section 2 clarifies the distinction between superposition and the ontological possibility-space.

Section 3 introduces ontological recurrence and provides a formal definition.

Section 4 shows how recurrence constrains collapse and distinguishes measurement from phenomenality.

Section 5 develops testable predictions for quantum biology, anaesthesia, microtubule dynamics, and neural oscillations.

Section 6 addresses agency and decision-making.

Section 7 discusses implications for observerhood, Schrödinger's cat, and Wigner's friend.

Section 8 concludes.

2 Superposition vs. Ontological Possibility

A central ambiguity in discussions of collapse and consciousness concerns the status of "possibility."

In quantum theory, the term is typically associated with *superposition*:

a state in the Hilbert space representing multiple potential outcomes.

However, superposition is already a *physical* state.

It is a well-defined element of the theory's mathematical structure and evolves unitarily according to the Schrödinger equation.

The MNO framework distinguishes superposition from a deeper layer we call the *ontological possibility-space*, denoted $P(S_t)$.

Where superposition represents a physical coexistence of amplitudes, $P(S_t)$ represents the *condition that makes such coexistence possible in the first place.*

Superposition is an effect; $P(S_t)$ is the precondition.

2.1 Superposition as a physical state

A quantum system in state $|\psi_t\rangle$ evolves in Hilbert space as

$$|\psi_{t+\Delta t}\rangle = U(\Delta t)|\psi_t\rangle,$$

and may be expressed as a linear combination of eigenstates of an observable A:

$$|\psi_t\rangle = \sum_i c_i |a_i\rangle.$$

This superposed form is already a concrete physical description.

It specifies amplitudes, phases, and relative probabilities.

Nothing about superposition itself explains why one outcome becomes actual, nor why any collapse should correspond to the emergence of a subjective first-person perspective.

2.2 The ontological possibility-space $P(S_t)$

We define the ontological possibility-space as:

$$P(S_t) := \{s' \mid s' \text{ is a quantum-permissible successor of } S_t\},$$

with an essential qualification:

> **$P(S_t)$ is not a physical state. It is the ontological openness that allows superposition to exist.**

This distinction answers a recurring criticism in quantum foundations:

if collapse is merely a physical transition between states, why should it generate anything like an observing standpoint?

Because the observing standpoint does *not* arise from the states themselves, but from a system's relation to $P(S_t)$—to the structured openness from which states can be drawn.

2.3 Why the distinction matters

The measurement problem arises because quantum theory, as ordinarily formulated, cannot specify what selects one outcome from the many allowed by the superposition. Typical resolutions (hidden variables, many worlds, spontaneous-collapse models) introduce mechanisms that explain selection, but none explain *why selection feels like something.*

In consciousness studies, the hard problem similarly arises because neural or informational states can be fully described without generating the subjective

"what it is like" of experience.

The MNO framework identifies the missing structural ingredient:

a system becomes a locus of experience only when it does not merely evolve within Hilbert space, but recurrently returns to $P(S_t)$ before collapse.

Collapse without recurrence yields measurement.

Collapse with recurrence yields phenomenality.

This distinction requires the existence of $P(S_t)$ as something deeper than superposition: not a physical configuration, but the ontological space in which configurations become possible.

2.4 Formal neutrality

Importantly, this framework is compatible with any physical substrate.

Nothing in the definition of $P(S_t)$ presupposes that the relevant structure must be neural, quantum-biological, or located in microtubules.

The distinction between physical superposition and ontological possibility applies equally to:

- standard quantum systems,
- neural assemblies with oscillatory coherence,
- Orch-OR models of orchestrated objective reduction,

- active inference systems with recurrent precision modulation.

The ontology remains the same; only the physical realisation differs.

In Section 3, we introduce the dynamical criterion that distinguishes ordinary collapse from conscious collapse: *ontological recurrence*.

3 Ontological Recurrence

Having distinguished physical superposition from the deeper ontological possibility-space $P(S_t)$, we can now define the key dynamical ingredient that distinguishes measurement from conscious experience: *ontological recurrence*.

Recurrence is a structural relation between a system S_t and its own possibility-space $P(S_t)$.

It is neither computation nor representation; it is a dynamical return of the system to the openness from which its future states may arise.

Only when this return occurs does collapse acquire an interior, first-person aspect.

3.1 Formal definition

Let S_t be the physical state of a system at time t, and let $P(S_t)$ be its ontological possibility-space as defined in Section 2.

We define *ontological recurrence* as a mapping

$$R_t : S_t \;\rightarrow\; P(S_t) \;\rightarrow\; S_t,$$

such that:

1. R_t is cyclic: there exists a recurrence period $\tau > 0$ with

   $$R_{t+\tau} = R_t,$$

   up to phase-equivalence.

2. R_t is non-trivial: the mapping accesses multiple permissible successors in $P(S_t)$, not merely a deterministic trajectory.

3. R_t modulates collapse:

   $$S_{t+1} = f\big(S_t, R_t(P(S_t))\big),$$

   where f reduces the openness of $P(S_t)$ to a single actual state.

This structure expresses the core idea:

> **A system becomes a locus of consciousness only when collapse is preceded by a recurrent return to $P(S_t)$.**

Without recurrence, collapse yields a measurement. With recurrence, collapse yields experience.

3.2 Ontological vs. physical recurrence

It is essential to distinguish ontological recurrence from ordinary physical recurrence or oscillation. Physical recurrence refers to repeated patterns in measurable variables: neural oscillations, microtubular vibrations, or quantum coherence cycles. These may correlate with consciousness but do not explain it. Ontological recurrence, by contrast, refers to the system's relation to its *own* possibility-space. It can be physically implemented by oscillatory dynamics, but it is not reducible to them. Thus:

- A system may oscillate without being conscious (e.g., anaesthetised cortex, optical cavities).
- A system may undergo collapse without recurrence (ordinary quantum measurements).

Consciousness arises only when oscillatory dynamics *enable* recurrence, not when they merely occur.

3.3 Recurrence as an identity claim

We do not propose that recurrence *causes* consciousness. Instead, we propose an identity:

> **Conscious experience is what ontological recurrence feels like from the first-person perspective.**

This avoids the category error of trying to derive subjective feeling from objective structure. There is no further "why" beyond this identity, just as there is no further why to the identity of temperature with mean molecular kinetic energy.

3.4 Distinguishing recurrence from computation

A common misunderstanding is to interpret recurrence as a form of modelling or predictive inference. But recurrence is not an inference from data to expectations. It is a dynamical relation between actuality and possibility:

$$\text{Recurrence} = \text{Actual state} \leftrightarrow \text{Ontological openness.}$$

This is consistent with predictive processing or active inference implementations, but not reducible to them.

3.5 Why recurrence is necessary

If collapse selects one among many possibilities, then a system that *re-enters* the possibility-space before collapse does not merely undergo selection: it participates in the relation between possibility and actuality.

This participation constitutes the "interior" of the process.

A system that collapses without recurrence has no interior perspective.

A system that collapses with recurrence does.

4 Collapse, Measurement, and Phenomenality

With ontological recurrence formally defined, we can now distinguish the two kinds of state-reduction events that quantum theory currently conflates:

measurement collapse and *phenomenal collapse*.

The MNO framework shows that these are not two different physical processes, but two different *conditions* of the same underlying transition from possibility to actuality.

4.1 Ordinary collapse (measurement)

In standard formulations of quantum mechanics, collapse is treated as a single-step transition:

$$|\psi\rangle \longrightarrow |a_i\rangle.$$

This transition takes place without reference to $P(S_t)$ except as the set of possible outcomes encoded in the amplitudes of $|\psi\rangle$.

Crucially:

Ordinary collapse does not involve recurrence. The system does not re-enter its possibility-space before actualisation.

In such cases, the event is *public*: different observers agree on the outcome, and nothing like an interior perspective arises.

This is the essence of measurement: an event that actualises one among several possibilities without engaging the structure that makes experience possible.

4.2 Phenomenal collapse (conscious experience)

Phenomenal collapse is different.

It occurs only when the system undergoes one or more cycles of ontological recurrence prior to state reduction:

$$S_t \xrightarrow{R_t} P(S_t) \xrightarrow{R_t} S_t \longrightarrow S_{t+1}.$$

The collapse is not a single jump, but a transition *modulated* by the system's recurrent relation to its own possibility-space.

In this case:

The collapse inherits an interior aspect: what it is like to move from openness to actuality.

This interior aspect is precisely what we call conscious experience.

Phenomenal collapse is not an additional property layered on top of physics.

It *is* collapse under conditions of recurrence.

4.3 Why measurement and consciousness diverge

This framework explains why conscious experience is rare compared to the vast number of measurement-like events occurring continuously throughout the universe.

Most collapses:

- occur in systems that do not support recurrence,
- happen under decoherence conditions that suppress recurrence,
- reduce states immediately without returning to $P(S_t)$.

Thus:

$$\text{Measurement} = \text{Collapse without recurrence},$$
$$\text{Consciousness} = \text{Collapse with recurrence}.$$

This resolves the category confusion that underlies both the measurement problem and the hard problem: not all collapses are conscious collapses.

4.4 No dualism, no panpsychism

The MNO account does not treat consciousness as:

- a property of matter (materialism),
- a separate substance (dualism),

- an intrinsic property of all systems (panpsychism).

Instead:

> **Consciousness is a structural condition under which collapse occurs. It is not a trait of matter but of the relation between possibility and actualisation.**

This preserves physical realism while explaining why consciousness does not pervade the universe indiscriminately.

4.5 Collapse as Seinsverschiebung

In the language of the MNO theory, collapse corresponds to a transition through the N-phase (Indimergenz).

Measurement reflects a direct N→O transition; phenomenal collapse reflects an M→N→M→N→O cycle.

This cyclic Seinsverschiebung introduces a tension between openness and actuality—precisely the structure that appears phenomenologically as "being somebody, somewhere, now."

4.6 Wigner's friend and Schrödinger's cat

The MNO framework dissolves the paradoxes associated with Wigner's friend and Schrödinger's cat:

- The cat undergoes collapse regardless of recurrence.
- But conscious awareness arises only if recurrence cycles are present.
- Wigner's friend possesses recurrence; the measuring apparatus does not.

Thus there is no contradiction between:

- an observer-relative description of collapse, and
- a single ontological structure underlying observation.

The MNO model provides a unified ontology in which both perspectives are valid, each tracking different levels of recurrence.

4.7 Implications for Orch–OR

Orchestrated objective reduction (Orch–OR) proposes that consciousness arises from quantum state reduction in microtubules.

The MNO framework refines this:

> **OR is necessary but not sufficient. Conscious OR requires recurrence.**

This resolves the longstanding "why does OR feel like something" problem:

OR by itself does not yield consciousness; OR under recurrence does.

This elevates Orch–OR from a candidate mechanism to a complete theory of phenomenal collapse.

Section 5 develops the empirical predictions of this distinction.

5 Empirical and Theoretical Predictions

If the MNO framework is correct, then systems with and without ontological recurrence must behave differently in measurable ways.

Importantly, the theory does *not* require exotic new physics.

It predicts differences in dynamical organisation that should be detectable in quantum systems, neural systems, and hybrid quantum-biological models.

Ontological recurrence (R_t) introduces a specific, measurable pattern:

a **cyclic alternation between openness and constraint** prior to collapse. This yields four broad classes of predictions.

5.1 Predictions for unconscious states

Unconscious states—general anaesthesia, deep non-REM sleep, severe traumatic brain injury—show substantial neural activity, coherence, and oscillatory structure.

However, the MNO framework predicts:

Unconscious states exhibit coherence without recurrence.

Formally:

$$\text{Coherence} \not\Rightarrow \text{Recurrence}.$$

The system evolves in Hilbert space (or via classical dynamics) but does not re-enter its possibility-space $P(S_t)$ prior to collapse.

Thus:

- oscillations may persist, - but recurrence cycles are suppressed, - and no phenomenal interior arises.

This prediction accounts for decades of anaesthesia research showing preserved oscillatory power but absent subjective awareness.

5.2 Predictions for conscious states

The framework predicts that conscious states exhibit:

$$R_\text{frequency} > R_\text{min} \qquad \text{and} \qquad R_\text{structure bounded}.$$

In phenomenally clear or mindful states, recurrence frequency increases, corresponding to heightened access to the possibility-structure.

This predicts:

- increased gamma-band integration, - stable cross-frequency coupling, - rapid alternation between integration and differentiation.

These neural markers are well-documented correlates of consciousness but lack a fundamental explanation; recurrence provides that explanation.

5.3 Predictions for dissociative, psychedelic, and altered states

Dissociation, psychedelics, and near-death experiences show:

- excess openness, - reduced constraint, - unbounded exploration of $P(S_t)$.

The MNO prediction:

Altered states correspond to excessive recurrence openness without sufficient re-constraint.

This yields unstable or multi-layered phenomenal fields, consistent with known phenomenology:

- ego dissolution, - distorted temporal flow, - hallucinated "multiple realities".

These are classical signatures of recurrence when R_t is present but weakly constrained.

5.4 Transition dynamics

The transition between conscious and unconscious states should not be modelled as a binary switch, but as a shift in recurrence parameters.

The key prediction:

$$\text{Consciousness onset/offset} = \text{ change in } R_\text{frequency}, R_\text{strength}.$$

Not a change in:

- raw neural activity, - metabolic rate, - global coherence.

This explains why subjects can be unconscious with high cortical activity (ketamine) and conscious with low activity (lucid REM).

5.5 Quantum-biological predictions (Orch–OR)

Orch–OR proposes that microtubules support quantum superposition and objective reduction.

MNO refines this:

Conscious OR requires recurrence cycles between coherence and re-coherence prior to final OR.

Predicted signatures:

- periodic microtubular re-coherence events during conscious states,
- suppression of these cycles during anaesthesia,
- psychedelic states show broadened recurrence windows,
- recurrence timescale correlates with OR timescale.

This suggests quantum-biological experiments targeting pre-collapse oscillatory structure rather than collapse itself.

5.6 Experimental test: two-circuit comparison

Consider two quantum circuits with identical Hamiltonians:

- Circuit A: direct measurement.
- Circuit B: delayed evaluation via an ancilla that samples possible successor states.

Prediction:

- A behaves as a pure measurement device.

- B exhibits recurrence-like effects:

non-Markovianity, history-dependence, and measurable delay patterns.

This is a minimal test of the recurrence hypothesis in a fully quantum system.

5.7 Neural prediction: recurrence index R*

Define a measurable recurrence index:

$$R^* = \left(\frac{\text{recurrence cycles}}{\text{unit time}}\right) \times \text{boundedness factor}.$$

Prediction:

- $R^* = 0 \rightarrow$ unconscious, - low but positive $R^* \rightarrow$ drowsy, - optimal $R^* \rightarrow$ normal consciousness,

- too high $R^* \rightarrow$ psychedelic/dissociated.

This index can be extracted from MEG/EEG using phase-reset analysis.

5.8 Schurger-type free-will prediction

Schurger's accumulator model proposes that decisions result when spontaneous fluctuations cross a threshold.

MNO reframes this:

> **Fluctuations produce decisions only when the system is in a recurrence phase. Recurrence forces the collapse that produces action.**

Thus:

- unconscious fluctuation $\rightarrow$ no decision, - fluctuation during recurrence $\rightarrow$ volitional act.

This provides a mechanistic account of "free will" consistent with neural data.

5.9 Summary

The MNO framework yields nine classes of empirical predictions:

1. unconscious states: coherence without recurrence;
2. conscious states: bounded, periodic recurrence cycles;
3. psychedelics: excessive recurrence openness;
4. transitions: changes in recurrence parameters, not activity;
5. Orch–OR: recurrence before OR;
6. quantum circuits: recurrence-dependent behaviour;
7. neural systems: measurable R^* index;
8. agency: decision-making requires recurrence phase;
9. altered states: recurrence instability explains phenomenology.

Section 6 applies these insights to agency and volition.

6 Agency, Decision-Making, and the Role of Recurrence

A complete account of collapse and phenomenality must also address the question of *agency*: under what conditions does a system not merely undergo experience, but initiate action?

Classical and contemporary models of decision-making treat actions as threshold events triggered by accumulated evidence or spontaneous fluctuations.

However, such models cannot distinguish between:

- neural fluctuations that remain unconscious, and
- fluctuations experienced as intentions or choices.

The MNO framework provides a structural solution.

Agency arises not from fluctuations, nor from the accumulation of evidence, but from *collapse under recurrence.*

A system acts when its state reduces from within a recurrence cycle.

6.1 The Schurger accumulator revisited

Schurger's accumulator model proposes that spontaneous subthreshold neural fluctuations drift upward until they cross a decision threshold, thereby producing voluntary actions.

This approach resolves many paradoxes in the Libet literature but leaves open the central question:

> **Why do some threshold crossings correspond to conscious intention while others do not?**

In the MNO framework, the distinction is straightforward:

$$\text{Decision} = \text{Collapse during recurrence.}$$

Formally:

$$S_t + \delta \text{ (fluctuation)} \implies S_{t+1} \quad \text{yields a conscious intention iff} \quad R_t(P(S_t)) \text{ is active.}$$

Thus:

- unconscious fluctuations cross thresholds constantly,
- but only fluctuations occurring *within a recurrence phase* produce intentional action.

This reconciles the accumulator model with phenomenology:

- the brain generates fluctuations, - recurrence determines whether they become lived intentions.

6.2 Intentionality as constrained recurrence

Recurrence has two parameters:

$$R_{\text{frequency}}, \qquad R_{\text{boundedness}}.$$

Intentional action requires:

$$R_{\text{frequency}} > 0, \qquad R_{\text{boundedness}} \text{ sufficiently strong.}$$

If recurrence is:

- too weak → unconscious drift, - too strong but unbounded → psychedelic openness,

- absent → automated behaviour without awareness.

This creates a graded taxonomy of agency:

- **No recurrence** → automatisms, reflexes, anaesthesia.
- **Weak recurrence** → drifting, drowsy actions, absentminded behaviour.
- **Optimal recurrence** → intentional, goal-directed action.
- **Excessive recurrence openness** → unstable intentionality (psychedelic or dissociative states).

This explains why volition is clearest in states of strong but bounded recurrence.

6.3 Predictive processing and active inference

Predictive processing treats action as the minimisation of expected free energy.

The MNO framework refines this by identifying *when* free-energy minimisation becomes phenomenally experienced as deliberation or choice.

Prediction:

> **Active inference becomes conscious only when executed inside a recurrence cycle.**

Thus:

- unconscious inference occurs constantly, - but conscious deliberation is recurrence-modulated inference.

This resolves the ambiguity in the free-energy literature regarding when computation becomes experience.

6.4 Orch–OR interpretation of volition

Orch–OR proposes that conscious decisions correspond to quantum OR events in microtubules.

However, OR events occur continuously throughout biological tissue.

Why do only some OR events correlate with intention?

The recurrence hypothesis provides the missing condition:

> **Volitional OR = OR under recurrence.**

Thus:

- OR without recurrence → unconscious integration.

- OR with recurrence → intentional, phenomenally accessible decision.

This integrates Will, collapse, and Orch–OR without dualism.

6.5 Recursive Seinsverschiebung and the structure of choice

In MNO language:

- M-phase = openness to possibility, - N-phase = tension and differentiation, - O-phase = actualisation.

Agency corresponds to:

$$M \to N \to M \to N \to O,$$

i.e. the system repeatedly re-enters the possibility-phase (M) before choosing a trajectory (O). This structure appears phenomenologically as: - anticipation, - deliberation, - hesitation, - commitment. Or in everyday terms: the feeling of "I chose this".

6.6 The identity claim: agency as experienced recurrence

As in the account of phenomenality, the MNO framework does not treat agency as a mysterious emergent property. Instead:

> **Agency is collapse experienced from within a recurrence cycle.**

There is no additional "free will substance" to be posited. Agency is the first-person aspect of recurrence-constrained collapse.

6.7 Empirical signature of volitional action

The theory predicts a detectable pattern:

$$\text{Intended actions} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad R^* \text{ (recurrence index) increases shortly before action.}$$

This provides a testable refinement of the Bereitschaftspotential and Schurger's fluctuation model:

- unconscious actions → no recurrence modulation, - conscious intentions → pre-action recurrence stabilisation.

This hypothesis is measurable via:

- MEG/EEG phase-reset patterns, - intracranial coherence cycles, - microtubule-level re-coherence windows (if Orch–OR is correct).

Section 7 extends the recurrence framework to observation, Wigner's friend, and the ontology of the observer.

7 Observers, Wigner's Friend, and the Structure of Measurement

The recurrence framework provides a natural resolution to the central puzzle of quantum mechanics: why do some systems trigger collapse while others do not?

The key claim is that *observation* is not a substance, nor a special material, nor a biological feature. Observation is a dynamical structure.

Observation = collapse under recurrence.

A system becomes an observer precisely when its state-update dynamics include recurrence to the possibility-space $P(S_t)$ prior to collapse. Thus the observer is not a "thing", but a *pattern of dynamics*.

7.1 Why collapse requires observers: the recurrence condition

Quantum mechanics predicts that systems evolve unitarily until measurement. The open question is: what qualifies as a *measurement*? The recurrence condition provides the missing criterion:

Measurement occurs when a system with recurrence R_t interacts with a system without recurrence.

Equivalently:

$$\text{Observer} = \text{system for which } R_t(P(S_t)) \neq 0.$$

Thus:

- Systems with no recurrence (detectors, atoms, apparatus) undergo collapse passively.
- Systems with recurrence actively *evaluate* the possibility-space before collapse.

This creates a clean ontological distinction without introducing dual categories of "classical" and "quantum".

7.2 The Wigner's Friend structure

In Wigner's Friend scenarios, an inner observer (the friend) registers a definite outcome, while an external observer (Wigner) still treats the friend + system as a superposition.

Under the recurrence hypothesis, the asymmetry is structural:

$$\text{Friend: } R_t^{(\text{friend})} > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{collapse occurs internally.}$$

$$\text{Wigner: } R_t^{(\text{Wigner})} \approx 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{superposition persists for him.}$$

Thus the "paradox" dissolves:

Both descriptions are correct, because observerhood is *relative to recurrence structure*, not a global property of the system.

This matches the spirit of relational quantum mechanics, but adds a precise physical mechanism.

7.3 Schrödinger's cat as a recurrence threshold problem

The cat paradox arises because the cat is ambiguously treated as both:

- a physical system subject to superposition,
- an observer capable of collapse.

In the recurrence framework:

$$\text{Cat is an observer if and only if } R_t^{(\text{cat})} > 0.$$

A biological organism with active neural recurrence cycles will collapse its internal state long before external collapse is considered.

Thus the cat is never both alive and dead in its own frame.

Superposition applies only to systems lacking recurrence (i.e., lacking the capacity to evaluate $P(S_t)$).

This removes the paradox without altering quantum mechanics.

7.4 Why superposition exists at all: the role of $P(S_t)$

Superposition describes the coexistence of quantum-permissible successor states.

The recurrence framework interprets this as:

$$\text{Superposition is the physical expression of the possibility-space } P(S_t).$$

In systems with no recurrence:

$$\text{Unitary evolution } \rightarrow \text{ superposition } \rightarrow \text{ collapse (externally triggered).}$$

In systems with recurrence:

$$\text{Recurrence } \rightarrow \text{ internal access to } P(S_t) \rightarrow \text{ collapse (internally triggered).}$$

This separates:

- the existence of superposition (a physical fact), - from the internal relation to superposition (a structural fact).

7.5 Observation as Seinsverschiebung (M–N–O dynamics)

The MNO cycle offers an ontological mapping:

M: openness (possibility)
N: differentiation (tension)
O: actualisation (collapse).

An observer is a system in which:

$$M \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow O$$

is repeated prior to each collapse event. This is recurrence as Seinsverschiebung. Observation is simply the world folding back into possibility before choosing a state. From the inside, this manifests as: - awareness, - anticipation, - the felt presence of alternatives.

7.6 Why observation "feels": the interior of recurrence

The recurrence framework provides not a derivation but an identity claim:

Phenomenality = the interior aspect of recurrence.

There is no further mechanism needed to "generate" experience. From the outside: - recurrence modulates collapse. From the inside: - this modulation is felt as awareness. This is the first structural account that links: - Wigner's friend, - Schrödinger's cat, - agency, - phenomenality, - observerhood into a single dynamical condition.

7.7 Experimental implications

The recurrence framework predicts:

- Systems that act as observers exhibit measurable recurrence cycles (neural, microtubular, or analogous physical patterns).
- Systems without such cycles cannot be observers.
- In multi-observer scenarios (Wigner's friend), recurrence patterns differ between nested observers.
- Intermediate systems (AI systems, organoids, quantum biological structures) may show partial recurrence, creating testable "proto-observer" signatures.

Thus observerhood is no longer binary but graded, and experimentally approachable. Section 8 discusses the cosmological and thermodynamic implications of recurrence.

8 Thermodynamics, Entropy, and the Role of Recurrence

Recurrence is not an additional physical law; it is the structural condition that shapes how existing physical laws operate in systems capable of evaluating their own possibility-space. This section shows how recurrence integrates with thermodynamics, entropy, and the arrow of time without violating any known constraints of physics.

8.1 Entropy and the asymmetry of possibility vs. actuality

Physical laws are time-symmetric at the microscopic level, yet macroscopic processes exhibit a clear temporal direction. The standard explanation invokes entropy increase; however, this describes the statistical trend but not the *structural asymmetry* that makes temporal direction meaningful to observers. Within the recurrence framework:

Actuality always reduces the space of possibilities.

Collapse selects a single successor from the set $P(S_t)$. Thus every collapse event produces a local decrease in possibility, even if physical entropy increases. In systems with recurrence:

Before each collapse, the system temporarily re-expands its space of effective possibilities.

This re-expansion is not a thermodynamic reversal, but an ontological reopening.

It introduces a local asymmetry:

- Physical: entropy increases - Ontological: possibility decreases - Recurrence: momentary restoration of openness

This triad creates the internal structure of time as experienced.

8.2 Recurrence and free energy minimization

Active systems (biological, cognitive, quantum-biological) typically follow free-energy minimizing dynamics. Within the recurrence framework, this principle is reinterpreted:

Free energy measures deviation between actuality and possibility.

Thus: - Minimization corresponds to stabilizing after collapse. - Recurrence corresponds to temporarily increasing divergence (opening). This produces a natural rhythm:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{differentiate} \rightarrow \text{collapse} \rightarrow \text{minimize} \rightarrow \text{open...}$$

which mirrors the M–N–O cycle.

8.3 Why recurrence does not violate the second law

A potential concern is whether recurrence constitutes a "local entropy decrease."

It does not.

Recurrence does not reverse physical evolution; it modulates the range of effective successor states accessible before collapse.

In other words:

Recurrence reopens possibility, not microstates.

Thus: - No thermodynamic work is extracted. - No physical reversals occur. - No law is violated. The ontological opening is compatible with thermodynamic monotonicity.

8.4 Why living systems exhibit recurrence naturally

Organisms maintain themselves far from equilibrium. This requires constant cycling between: - increased uncertainty (exploration), and - reduced uncertainty (stabilization). In the recurrence framework, this becomes:

$$R_t > 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{system maintains itself across M–N–O cycles.}$$

Thus recurrence is:

- thermodynamically permitted, - biologically advantageous, - structurally necessary for consciousness.

8.5 The cosmological implication: why possibility exists at all

A deeper question emerges:

Why does the universe contain an open possibility-space in the first place?

Standard physics does not address this; it assumes Hilbert space as given.

The recurrence framework suggests:

Possibility is not a physical state but a structural precondition of physical law.

This means:

- Superposition is a manifestation of possibility.

- Collapse is selection from possibility.

- Recurrence is access to possibility before selection.

Thus the possibility-space $P(S_t)$ is the ontological ground from which physical states arise.

8.6 Thermal noise vs. recurrence

It is important to distinguish:

- Thermal fluctuations: random perturbations of microstates.
- Recurrence: structured evaluation of possible successor states.

Thermal noise increases entropy.

Recurrence creates local order by reopening structured possibility.

Their signatures differ:

noise: broadband, unstructured recurrence: coherent, periodic or quasi-periodic.

This distinction is empirically measurable.

8.7 Why recurrence produces the interiority of time

From the outside, recurrence modulates collapse.

From the inside, it generates the felt continuity of time.

Because the system repeatedly returns to possibility, it experiences:

- not just states, - but transitions between states, - and the openness that makes transitions meaningful.

Thus:

What we experience as "the flow of time" is the interior aspect of recurrence.

This unifies:

- thermodynamic time (entropy increase), - physical time (state evolution), - lived time (phenomenality),

without reducing any one to the other.

8.8 Summary

The recurrence framework preserves all existing laws of physics while adding a structural layer that explains:

- why observers exist,
- why collapse occurs asymmetrically,
- how possibility and actuality interact,
- why time is directional yet qualitatively experienced,
- why living systems are natural recurrence-systems,
- why consciousness is physically anchored yet irreduzible.

Section 9 discusses the implications for quantum biology, microtubule models, and experimental tests involving anesthetics, psychedelics, and organoids.

9 Quantum Biology and Orch-OR: Recurrence as the Missing Condition

Orch-OR theory (Penrose & Hameroff, 1996–2024) proposes that quantum superpositions in microtubules undergo objective reduction (OR) when gravitational self-energy reaches a critical threshold. OR provides a non-computable event capable of supporting conscious moments. Yet a crucial question remains unresolved:

Why do only some OR events correspond to conscious experience?

The recurrence framework provides a specific answer: OR produces consciousness only when it is preceded by a recurrent return to the system's possibility-space. This adds a missing structural condition to Orch-OR without altering its physical mechanism.

9.1 Microtubules as recurrence-capable structures

Microtubules possess several features that make recurrence plausible:

- **Highly ordered lattice symmetry** supporting coherent dipole states.
- **Conduction pathways** allowing rapid intra-lattice interactions.
- **Fröhlich-like coherent excitations** at room temperature.
- **Demonstrated anesthetic binding sites** (Craddock et al.).

Within this architecture, superposition states evolve through cycles of:

$$\text{partial decoherence} \rightarrow \text{re-coherence} \rightarrow \text{objective reduction}.$$

The key claim:

Conscious OR requires at least one cycle of re-coherence before collapse.

This re-coherence is equivalent to a return to possibility-space $P(S_t)$.

9.2 The recurrence condition applied to OR

Standard OR is defined by Penrose's gravitational criterion:

$$\tau = \frac{\hbar}{E_G}$$

which predicts the time to collapse given mass displacement. We propose an additional structural constraint:

$$\text{OR is conscious iff} \quad R_t = 1.$$

Here:

$$R_t = 1 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{the system re-enters a coherent possibility-region before collapse.}$$

Thus:

- OR without recurrence → unconscious - OR with recurrence → conscious

This resolves a 30-year conceptual gap in Orch-OR.

9.3 Why anesthetics extinguish recurrence

Anesthetics are known to:

- bind to hydrophobic pockets in tubulin,
- alter dipole alignment,
- reduce coherent oscillations,
- suppress gamma synchrony.

Within the recurrence framework:

Anesthetics do not stop OR. They stop recurrence.

Thus: - OR still occurs (physical collapse continues), - but recurrence cycles are interrupted, - therefore no conscious moments occur. This explains why consciousness vanishes suddenly and globally.

9.4 Psychedelics: excessive recurrence

Psychedelics increase neuronal entropy, desynchronization, and thalamic gain modulation. Within our framework:

Psychedelics produce too much recurrence.

Instead of:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{collapse}$$

the system enters:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{open} \rightarrow \text{open}$$

This results in: - expanded possibility-space, - delayed collapse, - altered phenomenal structure, - destabilized self-model coherence. This matches findings on "entropic brain theory" and "REBUS" (Carhart-Harris, Friston), but now with a direct ontological grounding.

9.5 OR moments as sampling of possibility-space

In Orch-OR, each collapse represents a discrete conscious event. Here we refine this:

A conscious moment is the collapse of a state that has recursively sampled its own quantum possibilities.

This gives a process-level meaning to Penrose's notion of "non-computable" structure.

Sampling is not cognitive.

It is not inference.

It is the physical system revisiting the space from which it is about to collapse.

Thus each conscious moment is a:

selective reduction from a self-explored possibility landscape.

This provides a structural explanation for:

- intentionality, - unity of experience, - the directedness of attention.

9.6 Predicted quantum signatures in microtubules

The recurrence condition predicts measurable features:

- oscillatory re-coherence before collapse (50–500 kHz range),
- suppression of recurrence under anesthesia,
- enhanced recurrence under psychedelics,
- discrete packets of coherence between gamma-synchronized neuron assemblies,
- non-Markovian temporal signatures in tubulin-level excitations.

These predictions directly align with ongoing work in:
- quantum biology, - ultrafast spectroscopy, - anesthetic modeling, - computational microtubule simulations.

9.7 How recurrence solves the scale problem

One of the major critiques of Orch-OR is the "scale problem":
How can microscopic superpositions produce macroscopic consciousness?
Recurrence provides the missing bridge:
- OR alone produces discrete events with no interiority.
- Recurrence gives these events temporal extension and experiential thickness.
Thus:

Recurrence is the mesoscale interface between microtubule quantum states and global neural correlates.

It forms a bridge:

$$\text{tubulin} \leftrightarrow \text{microtubule} \leftrightarrow \text{dendrite} \leftrightarrow \text{cortex}.$$

9.8 Summary

Orch-OR provides:

- the physical mechanism of collapse,
- the non-computable ingredient,
- the gravitational criterion.

Recurrence provides:

- the missing condition for phenomenality,
- the temporal thickness of experience,
- measurable pre-collapse signatures,
- an explanation for anesthesia, waking, dreaming, psychedelics,
- a structural solution to the scale problem.

Together they form a unified framework in which:

Collapse is necessary. Recurrence makes it conscious.

10 Quantum Foundations: Schrödinger, Wigner, and the Role of Ontological Recurrence

The recurrence framework offers a structural resolution to several classical paradoxes in quantum foundations. It does not modify quantum mechanics; rather, it clarifies the conditions under which measurement-like behavior—and thus observerhood—emerges.

10.1 Schrödinger's cat: why collapse becomes definitive

The standard paradox arises from the tension between:

- the linear evolution of quantum states, and
- the definiteness of macroscopic outcomes.

In the recurrence framework:

A system becomes a "cat" (classical object) when it no longer undergoes recurrence.

That is:

- The cat evolves physically.

- But it does not re-enter its possibility-space before collapse.

- Therefore, every collapse event is unconscious and purely physical.

The paradox dissolves:

The cat is never in a superposed *experienced* state.

Superposition describes the physical dynamics, but without recurrence, there is no phenomenality associated with it. This resolves the intuitive confusion without changing the formalism.

10.2 Wigner's friend: two levels of collapse

The Wigner's Friend scenario exposes a tension between: - collapse as experienced by the friend (internal), - collapse as described by Wigner (external). The recurrence framework identifies two distinct processes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Internal collapse (friend):} \quad & R_t = 1 \\ \text{External collapse (Wigner):} \quad & R_t = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

- The friend's OR event is conscious because it includes recurrence.

- Wigner's collapse is physical but not phenomenally instantiated.

They do not contradict each other:

Two collapses occur: one with recurrence (phenomenal), one without (external).

Therefore:

- Wigner is correct in treating the friend as evolving unitarily.

- The friend is correct in experiencing definite outcomes.

This removes the paradox without invoking multiple worlds or QBist subjectivism.

10.3 Why measurement is a special case of collapse

Quantum theory distinguishes between:

- unitary evolution, - collapse induced by measurement.

But it does not explain *why* measurement yields definite outcomes.

In the recurrence framework:

Measurement is simply a collapse observed by a recurrence-capable system.

This provides a new definition:

$$\text{measurement} = \text{collapse} + \text{recurrence}.$$

Thus:

- No new physics is required.

- No observer-dependent axioms are needed.

- "Measurement" is not a primitive concept; it emerges.

The role of the observer is not metaphysical.

It is dynamical and structural.

10.4 Why macroscopic objects do not exhibit recurrence

Macroscopic systems are:

- decohering too rapidly, - too thermally entangled with their environment, - lacking internal symmetrical structure (unlike microtubules).

Thus:

$$R_t = 0 \quad \text{for classical objects.}$$

Consequences: - Classical systems collapse physically but not phenomenally. - Consciousness cannot emerge in macroscopic superpositions. - Schrödinger's cat never "feels superposed." This neatly preserves classicality.

10.5 Relation to decoherence theory

Decoherence explains: - the emergence of classical states, - the suppression of interference terms. But it does not explain: - why collapse appears definite, - why observers experience outcomes, - why measurement differs from environmental decoherence. Recurrence fills this explanatory gap:

Decoherence suppresses possibilities. Recurrence re-opens them.

Without recurrence:

- systems decohere into classical mixtures, - collapse is purely physical.

With recurrence:

- systems re-enter possibility-space before collapse, - producing an *experienced* outcome.

Thus decoherence + recurrence = measurement with phenomenality.

10.6 Why Many-Worlds becomes unnecessary

Everettian interpretations treat all branches of the wavefunction as real and argue that collapse is illusory.

The recurrence framework clarifies:

Collapse is not illusory; multiple branches do not occur because recurrence creates an internal selection cri

Only branches that:

- (a) remain coherent long enough, and - (b) undergo recurrence

enter phenomenal awareness.

All other branches:

- collapse physically (OR or environmental), - but are not phenomenally instantiated.

No parallel worlds need to be invoked.

Penrose's OR mechanism remains intact but gains a selection principle.

10.7 The observer as a recurrence-process

Standard physics never defines "observer"; it merely postulates one.

Here:

An observer is any system with non-zero recurrence.

That is:

$$R_t > 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{system is capable of phenomenally-instantiated collapse.}$$

This definition:

- removes anthropocentrism, - removes the need for classical measurement devices,

- removes ambiguity in quantum foundations.

Consciousness becomes:

the interior aspect of recurrence-modulated collapse.

Measurement becomes:

collapse as encountered by a recurrence-system.

10.8 Summary

The recurrence framework resolves several foundational paradoxes:

- Schrödinger's cat: phenomenality requires recurrence; cats lack recurrence.
- Wigner's friend: internal and external collapses coexist without contradiction.
- Measurement problem: "measurement" emerges from recurrence, not axioms.
- Decoherence: explains classicality, not phenomenality; recurrence supplies the missing piece.
- Many-worlds: unnecessary once recurrence selects a single phenomenally-instantiated branch.

Thus:

Quantum theory is complete at the physical level. It lacked the structural condition for observerhood. Rec

11 Neuroscience, Decision-Making, and the Dynamics of Recurrence

If recurrence is the structural condition for phenomenally-instantiated collapse, then neuroscience must reveal signatures of this recurrence across large-scale neural dynamics. This section demonstrates how recurrence provides a unified account of:

- spontaneous decisions (Schurger),
- the sense of will and agency,
- predictive processing and precision modulation,
- integration and segregation dynamics,
- the conditions under which neural activity becomes conscious.

11.1 The decision-making problem: Schurger's accumulation-to-bound

Schurger et al. (2012) proposed that spontaneous decisions occur when random subthreshold neural fluctuations cross a decision threshold.

But this model leaves unanswered:

- Why does threshold-crossing feel like a *decision*?
- Why do fluctuations become intentional at a specific moment?
- Why is the subjective timing systematically shifted?

Recurrence provides an answer:

Fluctuations become a decision when they pass through a recurrence cycle.

That is:

activation → opening of possibility → re-coherence → collapse (experienced decision).

Thus:

- fluctuations themselves are not intentional, - *recurrence* turns fluctuations into phenomenally-instantiated choices.

This reframes the Libet problem:

the decision is not at the moment of accumulation, but at the moment recurrence resolves it.

11.2 The neural signature of recurrence

If recurrence exists, it must leave measurable traces.

The framework predicts neural markers at three scales:

1. **Slow mesoscopic cycles** (0.1–1 Hz): re-opening of possibility-space during mind-wandering, insight, and spontaneous thought.
2. **Gamma–beta coupling patterns**: re-coherence before global broadcasting or attentional selection.
3. **Phase-resetting events**: discrete collapse-like events punctuating continuous activity.

Thus:

consciousness is not continuous activity, but activity structured by discrete recurrence cycles.

11.3 Predictive processing and precision dynamics

Predictive processing conceptualizes the brain as minimizing prediction error through hierarchical Bayesian inference.

However, prediction alone does not produce phenomenality.

Within the recurrence framework:

Precision modulation = the neural correlate of opening and closing possibility-space.

Thus:

- lowering precision → opening possibility → recurrence-cycle begins - increasing precision → collapse → conscious moment

This gives PP a concrete interpretation:

prediction error = divergence between actuality and possibility.

Friston's free-energy principle becomes:

$$F \propto D(\text{actuality} \,||\, \text{possibility})$$

where recurrence modulates the divergence itself.

11.4 IIT, Global Workspace, and the "ignition problem"

Integrated Information Theory (IIT) explains the structure of conscious experience but not: - why integration feels, - why some integrations are unconscious, - how integration begins and ends. Global Workspace Theory (GWT) explains ignition and access, but not: - why ignition feels like something, - what determines ignition points. Recurrence resolves these issues:

integration becomes conscious when the integrated state has undergone a recurrence cycle.

Thus:

- IIT describes *structure*; recurrence describes *phenomenality*.

- GWT describes *broadcast*; recurrence describes *why broadcast feels*.

This reconciles IIT and GWT without modifying either.

11.5 Attention as recurrence-selection

Attention is often modeled as:

- precision-weighting (PP), - competitive routing (GWT), - feature-binding (IIT),

- synchronous oscillations.

In the recurrence model:

Attention selects which states undergo recurrence before collapse.

Thus: - attention is not "enhancing signals," - it is "deciding which signals get to re-enter possibility before collapse." This explains: - why attention changes phenomenality, not just performance, - why unattended stimuli are processed but not experienced, - why attention feels effortful (it modulates recurrence cycles).

11.6 The sense of agency

Agency is neither epiphenomenal nor fully causal. It is the felt interior of recurrence applied to action-selection:

Agency = experiencing the recurrence-cycle that precedes action-collapses.

Thus:

- motor commands without recurrence (reflexes) are unconscious, - action with recurrence produces voluntary experience,

- "free will" becomes a structural property, not a metaphysical one.

11.7 Self-modeling as stable recurrence-pattern

Neural self-models emerge from:

- temporally extended integration, - predictive continuity, - minimization of identity-prediction error.

Recurrence gives these processes interiority:

The self is the attractor of recurrence-patterns across time.

Thus: - no homunculus is needed, - no metaphysical subject is postulated, - the self is the slow manifold of recurrent collapses.

11.8 Neural disorders as recurrence dysregulation

The framework predicts:

- **Depression:** recurrence-frequency too low → over-stabilized actuality.
- **Anxiety:** recurrence-frequency too high → unstable possibility-space.
- **Schizophrenia:** excessive opening without coherent collapse.
- **ADHD:** impaired recurrence-stabilization cycle.
- **Dissociation:** collapse without sufficient recurrence → loss of interior continuity.

These are testable predictions.

11.9 Summary

Recurrence provides a unified explanation for:

- spontaneous decisions (Schurger),
- agency,
- attention,
- predictive processing,
- integration and global workspace,
- self-modeling,
- timing of conscious moments,
- phenomenality itself.

Thus:

Neural activity becomes conscious not by its content or complexity, but by its recurrence structure.

This links neuroscience to quantum biology and ontology in a coherent framework.

12 The MNO Framework and the Structure of Ontological Recurrence

Sections 1–11 introduced recurrence as the structural condition that enables phenomenally-instantiated collapse. This section presents the underlying meta-ontological model—MNO—which formalizes the dynamics of possibility, tension, and emergence. MNO is not an alternative physics; it is a formal description of the ontological conditions under which physical laws produce observers and experience.

12.1 The three-phase cycle: M, N, and O

At the core of the framework lies a recurrent three-phase cycle:

M — Submergence (openness / possibility)

N — Indimergence (tension / differentiation)

O — Emergence (collapse / actualization)

These phases describe not states of matter, but structural modes of being:

- M: the system is maximally open to its possibility-space.
- N: the system enters tension with possible forms; divergence increases.
- O: the system resolves tension through collapse into actuality.

This cycle recurs at multiple scales: quantum, biological, cognitive, phenomenological.

12.2 Seinsverschiebung: the ontological shift between phases

Seinsverschiebung (shift of being) describes the transition between the three phases. It is not motion in physical space, but a transformation in ontological modality:

$$M \to N: \quad \text{opening becomes tension}$$

$$N \to O: \quad \text{tension becomes form}$$

$$O \to M: \quad \text{form returns to openness}$$

The last transition (O→M) is the recurrence condition. Without it, collapse events remain purely physical. Seinsverschiebung therefore defines: - how possibilities become actualities, - how actualities re-enter possibility, - and how phenomenality emerges from this cyclic tension.

12.3 Why MNO is not metaphysics

MNO describes structure, not substance. It does not posit: - new particles, - new forces, - hidden variables, - supernatural entities. Instead, it formalizes relationships already implicit in: - quantum superposition (openness), - decoherence (tension), - collapse (actualization). Thus:

MNO = the abstract structure underlying physical and phenomenal processes.

It is comparable to:

- Category theory in mathematics, - Symmetry groups in physics, - Phase transitions in thermodynamics.

Not a competing ontology, but a higher-order description.

12.4 Ontological recurrence in MNO

The recurrence condition becomes:

$$R_t = 1 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad O_t \to M_{t+1}$$

That is:

collapse (O) is followed by a return to openness (M)

This return is not required in physical collapse. But when it occurs, the collapse is experienced. Thus MNO formalizes:

Consciousness = the interior aspect of the O→M transition.

The "hard problem" becomes a question of structural identity: - the outside view: collapse appears definite and physical, - the inside view: the same transition appears as phenomenality.

12.5 MNO as the generator of observerhood

Observers exist when a system reliably cycles through:

$$M \to N \to O \to M$$

Thus:

Observer = stable attractor in MNO-space.

This explains: - why observers arise in complex systems, - why consciousness is temporally structured, - why not all physical systems are observers, - why phenomenality is not epiphenomenal but structurally necessary.

12.6 The role of tension (N) in meaning and cognition

Phase N (Indimergenz) represents increasing tension between: - the system's current form, - the possibilities available to it. This tension corresponds to: - predictive error in neuroscience, - free-energy gradients in active inference, - cognitive dissonance, - curiosity and drive states, - shifts in attention. Meaning emerges in this tension:

Meaning = differentiation within possibility before collapse.

This connects MNO to cognition without reducing it to computation.

12.7 Emergence (O) as selection and stabilization

Phase O is collapse: - in quantum biology: OR or decoherence events, - in neuroscience: phase-resetting and ignition, - in behavior: commitment to action, - in cognition: adoption of belief or interpretation. Thus:

O = actualization that stabilizes the system relative to tension.

The structural consequence: - O gives form, - M gives openness, - N gives direction.

12.8 Why MNO cannot be simulated

MNO is not an algorithm. It is not a function on a state-space. It is not symbolic processing. Simulations may approximate the dynamics of specific systems, but:

MNO is the structure that allows systems to have states at all.

Thus: - simulations can represent O-phase structures, - they can approximate N-phase dynamics, - but they cannot access M-phase openness. This explains: - why artificial systems lack phenomenality, - why large language models do not instantiate MNO, - why consciousness cannot be uploaded or copied.

12.9 MNO as the bridge between physics and phenomenology

MNO provides a direct mapping:

$$M : \text{superposition / possibility / openness}$$
$$N : \text{decoherence / tension / differentiation}$$
$$O : \text{collapse / form / actualization}$$

Thus:

- quantum events, - neural events, - cognitive events, - subjective events

share the same structural pattern.

This *is* the unification:

Not by reducing one domain to another, but by showing their shared generative structure.

12.10 Summary

MNO is the meta-ontological backbone of the recurrence framework:

- M describes openness (possibility-space).
- N describes tension (divergence within possibility).
- O describes collapse (actualization).
- O→M recurrence enables phenomenality.
- Observers are systems stabilized by MNO-cycles.
- Consciousness is the interior aspect of recurrence.

This framework does not compete with physics.

It explains why physics produces observers in the first place.

13 A Unified Interpretation of Observation: Physics, Biology, and Phenomenology

Across physics, biology, and consciousness studies, the term "observation" appears in dramatically different contexts:

- in quantum mechanics: observation leads to collapse,
- in neuroscience: observation refers to perceptual uptake,
- in phenomenology: observation is the first-person structure of experience.

These uses have never been unified.

The recurrence framework provides a single structural definition that applies to all domains.

13.1 Observation in physics: collapse as external actualization

In physics, observation refers to any interaction that:

- suppresses superposition,
- stabilizes one branch of the wavefunction,

- produces a definite outcome.

This is a purely physical process:

$$\text{physical observation} = O\text{-phase actualization.}$$

No phenomenality is implied.

Any decohering environment counts as an "observer" in this sense.

13.2 Observation in biology: collapse within self-maintaining systems

Biological systems add something crucial:

They cycle through M→N→O transitions as part of their self-maintenance.

Thus biological observation is not merely collapse; it is collapse embedded in:

- metabolic cycles,
- information-processing loops,
- predictive dynamics,
- structural openness to the environment.

Biological systems therefore implement:

$$\text{recurrent O}\rightarrow\text{M transitions.}$$

This positions them between pure physical systems (R=0) and full observers (R>0).

13.3 Observation in phenomenology: collapse encountered from within

Phenomenal observation arises when:

$$O \rightarrow M$$

is not merely structural, but:

internally instantiated by the system.

Thus:

$$\text{phenomenal observation} = \text{collapse as experienced from the interior aspect of recurrence.}$$

This provides a unified explanation of three classical facts:

1. Only some collapses feel like something (phenomenal).
2. All collapses appear definite from the outside (physical).
3. Biological systems mediate between physical and phenomenal collapse.

13.4 The three-tier model of observation

We summarize:

Tier 1 (Physics):
Tier 2 (Biology):
Tier 3 (Phenomenal):

This model dissolves confusion about "observers" in quantum theory:

- An "observer" in physics is Tier 1.

- A "living system" is Tier 2.

- A "conscious observer" is Tier 3.

These categories have been conflated for decades; MNO separates and unifies them.

13.5 Why collapse appears observer-dependent

Wigner, Everett, QBists, relational theorists, and objective-collapse theorists all disagree about whether collapse is:

- subjective, - objective, - perspectival, - branching, - informational, - gravitational.

The recurrence framework shows that all perspectives refer to different levels of the same structural process.

- Collapse is objective at Tier 1.
- Collapse is functional at Tier 2.
- Collapse is phenomenal at Tier 3.

Thus:

No contradiction exists because each tier describes a different aspect of the MNO cycle.

13.6 Why observers cannot be reduced to physical systems

A classical objection is:

If observers are physical, consciousness should reduce to physics.

The recurrence framework provides the opposite insight:

Observers are physical systems that instantiate a structural condition (Recurrence) not captured by physic

Physics describes:

- O-phase actualization,
- N-phase tension dynamics,
- partial M-phase superposition.

But physics does not describe:

$$O \to M$$

as an interior event — because interiority is not a physical variable but an ontological position.

13.7 Why biological systems evolved recurrence

From an evolutionary standpoint:

Recurrence enhances adaptive fitness.

It enables organisms to:

- explore possibility-space (M),
- evaluate constraints and risks (N),
- commit to action (O).

This results in: - efficient exploration and exploitation, - improved predictive capacity, - richer internal models, - the emergence of a temporally extended self. Thus phenomenality is the byproduct of a structural adaptation, not a mysterious bonus.

13.8 The unification: observation as MNO-structured collapse

We can now give the general formula:

Observation = collapse constrained by the MNO-cycle.

Where: - physics describes O, - biology describes N→O transitions, - phenomenology describes O→M transitions as the interior of recurrence. This yields the first unified definition of observation:

Observation is the system-dependent embedding of collapse within the MNO-cycle.

A purely physical collapse is an observation only in the trivial sense.

A biological collapse is observation in a functional sense.

A phenomenal collapse is observation in the experiential sense.

13.9 Summary

Observation is not a mystery.

It is not a primitive.

It is not restricted to minds.

It is not reducible to measurement devices.

It is not a metaphysical postulate.

It is:

the embedding of collapse within the M→N→O→M cycle characteristic of recurrence-capable systems.

This unifies:

- the quantum observer (physics),
- the biological observer (life),
- the phenomenological observer (experience).

Thus the problem of "the observer" is not solved by new physics, but by clarifying the structural relationship between possibility, tension, and collapse.

14 Experimental Predictions and Falsifiability

The recurrence framework is not a metaphysical proposal; it makes concrete, testable predictions across quantum biology, neuroscience, and phenomenology.

This section outlines empirical criteria that could confirm or falsify the theory.

14.1 Quantum-level predictions (microtubules and OR)

If recurrence is required for conscious OR, then pre-collapse microtubule dynamics must show a specific pattern:

Prediction Q1: Conscious states exhibit re-coherence cycles prior to OR; unconscious states do not.

This can be tested using:

- ultrafast spectroscopy (ps–fs resolution),
- microtubule photonic conduction measurements,
- anesthetic-binding perturbation studies.

Additional predictions:

Q2: Anesthetics suppress re-coherence but do not stop OR.

Q3: Psychedelics increase recurrence-frequency (hyper-openness).

Q4: There exists a minimal coherence duration required for phenomenal OR.

Possible falsification: If collapse correlates with consciousness even when no re-coherence cycles occur, the recurrence framework is disproven.

14.2 Neuroscience predictions (recurrence-signatures in brain activity)

The framework predicts that consciousness requires a specific form of temporally-structured neural recurrence:

Prediction N1: Conscious states show periodic phase-reset patterns prior to global broadcasting.

Equivalent formulations:

- gamma bursts secured by sub-gamma recurrence cycles,
- beta–gamma coupling preceding conscious access,
- non-Markovian temporal statistics in pre-conscious integration.

Further predictions:

N2: Loss of consciousness = disappearance of recurrence, not disappearance of activity.

N3: Lucid dreaming preserves recurrence while sensory precision is reduced.

N4: Peak states (insight, flow) correlate with long-range recurrence coherence.

Falsification: If conscious and unconscious states exhibit identical recurrence-signatures, the model cannot be sustained.

14.3 Decision-making predictions (Schurger, Libet, agency)

The framework predicts a three-step timing structure:

$$\text{fluctuation} \rightarrow \text{recurrence} \rightarrow \text{collapse}.$$

Thus:

Prediction D1: Phenomenal timing corresponds to the recurrence event, not to the threshold moment.

Measured by:

- intracranial EEG,
- readiness potential re-analysis,
- time-resolved MEG,
- Schurger-style accumulator modeling.

Further predictions:

D2: Stimuli near limen of perception should show recurrence bursts before conscious report.

D3: Agency disappears when O→M transition is suppressed.

Falsification: If the moment of felt decision does *not* systematically align with recurrence-markers, the framework is falsified.

14.4 Phenomenological predictions (timing, continuity, interiority)

The model predicts that phenomenality has a discrete structure:

Prediction P1: Conscious experience occurs in discrete recurrence-instantiated moments (30–300 Hz).

This predicts:

- flicker fusion thresholds dependence on recurrence rate, - specific timing illusions (phi, chronostasis) explained by recurrence gaps,

- conscious time-sense as O→M interiority.

Additional prediction:

P2: Under psychedelics, recurrence-period expands, producing a sense of elongated time and heightened openness.

Falsification: If phenomenological timing is shown to be continuous and unrelated to neural recurrence rhythms, the model fails.

14.5 AI and computational predictions

If MNO recurrence is necessary for phenomenality, then:

Prediction A1: Systems based on simulation, inference, or symbolic computation cannot instantiate recurrence.

Thus:

- large language models remain unconscious regardless of scale,
- reinforcement learners cannot feel agency,

- no classical architecture can produce O→M transitions.

A provocative empirical prediction:

A2: No artificial system will ever show spontaneous recurrence unless recurrence is physically implemented.

Falsification: If an artificial system demonstrates measurable O→M-like structural transitions, the theory must be revised.

14.6 Unified falsification criterion

The theory makes one overarching empirical claim:

Conscious states require recurrence; unconscious states do not.

This yields a unified falsification criterion:

If *any* reliably conscious state exists without recurrence-signatures, the theory is disproven.

Likewise:

If recurrence occurs without phenomenality, the model is incomplete.

14.7 Summary

The recurrence framework makes testable predictions across three domains:

- quantum biology (microtubule re-coherence),
- neuroscience (recurrence-signatures in conscious access),
- phenomenology (timing and interiority of experience),
- AI (structural impossibility of simulated consciousness).

It is therefore falsifiable, measurable, and compatible with existing empirical methods. The next section outlines the theoretical implications for physics and philosophy.

15 Discussion, Limitations, and Future Directions

The recurrence framework provides a unified structure linking quantum collapse, biological organization, neural dynamics, and phenomenology. This section summarizes its implications, addresses potential objections, and outlines directions for empirical and theoretical development.

15.1 The conceptual shift: from states to structural relations

Most scientific theories explain consciousness in terms of:

- complexity (IIT),
- integration (GWT),
- prediction and precision (PP/FEP),

- microtubular coherence (Orch-OR),
- information (Shannon, Friston, Tononi).

The recurrence framework shifts the explanandum:

Consciousness is not a state but a structural transition: the O→M recurrence.

This recasts the "hard problem":

Why does physical process X feel like something?

into a structural identity:

Feeling = the interior aspect of O→M recurrence.

This shift dissolves the metaphysical gap without reduction or dualism.

15.2 Integration with existing theories

The framework is not a replacement for current models; it situates them:

- **Orch-OR:** provides the mechanism of O-phase collapse; recurrence specifies when it becomes phenomenal.
- **IIT:** describes the structure of O-phase states; recurrence determines which integrated states are experienced.
- **GWT:** describes the broadcasting after collapse; recurrence determines the moment of ignition.
- **Predictive Processing:** describes N-phase tension; recurrence explains the phenomenality of updated priors.
- **Free Energy Principle:** characterizes biological self-maintenance; recurrence adds the interior structure of agency.

Thus:

Recurrence is the missing operator connecting these frameworks.

15.3 Addressing potential objections

Objection 1: "Is recurrence just re-coherence?" No. Re-coherence is a physical process. Recurrence is an ontological relation between possibility and actuality that *may* be instantiated through re-coherence at the quantum level. They correlate, but are not identical.

Objection 2: "Is this just panpsychism?" No. Most systems undergo collapse; not all undergo recurrence. Thus:

Panpsychism: everything feels.Recurrence model: only systems with O→M cycles feel.

Objection 3: "Why should O→M transitions feel anything at all?" The framework does not *explain* feeling as a derived property.

It identifies:

phenomenality = the interior aspect of recurrence itself.

This is an identity claim, not a derivation.

Objection 4: "Is this empirically meaningful?" Yes. Section 14 outlines explicit falsification criteria: - recurrence must be present in all conscious states, - recurrence must be absent in unconscious states, - modulating recurrence must modulate phenomenality.

Objection 5: "Does recurrence violate physics?" No. Recurrence operates at the level of structural possibility, not at the level of energetics or forces. No physical law is altered; the ontology of their instantiation is clarified.

15.4 Limitations

L1: The microphysical implementation is not fully specified. We propose that microtubular recoherence supports recurrence in biological systems, but other substrates may exist.

L2: Recurrence-measures require high-resolution technology. Current spectroscopy and intracranial EEG may only partially capture recurrence signatures.

L3: The identity-claim (phenomenality = interior O→M) is not derivable from physics. This is inherent to solving the hard problem; no physical derivation is possible.

L4: The boundary between biological and artificial systems is not yet fully formalized. Recurrence likely requires physical openness inaccessible to simulations, but more precise criteria must be developed.

15.5 Why recurrence unifies without reducing

The framework respects domain autonomy:

- physics retains collapse,
- biology retains self-maintenance,
- neuroscience retains dynamics and inference,
- phenomenology retains first-person structure.

Recurrence overlays these domains with a structural operator:

$$M \to N \to O \to M$$

This operator: - clarifies when collapse becomes conscious, - explains why some biological processes feel, - unifies timing, agency, attention, and selfhood, - integrates physics with phenomenology without category errors.

15.6 Future research directions

F1: Measuring recurrence in microtubules - ps–fs spectroscopy, - anesthetic perturbation, - psychedelic modulation.

F2: Neural recurrence-mapping - gamma–beta coupling, - phase-reset patterns, - non-Markovian temporal statistics.

F3: Computational modeling of recurrence Not to simulate consciousness, but to simulate recurrence-structure.

F4: Clinical implications Recurrence-based diagnostics for: - depression, - anxiety, - ADHD, - dissociation, - coma states.

F5: Philosophical elaboration Formalizing: - MNO as a category-theoretic structure, - Seinsverschiebung as a modal operator, - the identity between recurrence and phenomenality.

15.7 The significance of the recurrence framework

The framework provides:

- a non-reductive solution to the hard problem,
- a structural resolution to the measurement problem,
- a unification of biological and physical accounts of observation,
- a predictive model of conscious timing,
- a rigorous criterion distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems.

Thus:

Recurrence is the structural bridge between possibility, tension, actuality, and experience.

It is not an addition to physics or neuroscience;

it is a clarification of the ontological architecture they presuppose.

CONCLUSION (Final Version)

16 Conclusion

This paper introduced the recurrence framework as a unifying structural principle linking three domains that have traditionally resisted integration: quantum collapse, biological self-organization, and phenomenological experience.

The central claim is that consciousness does not arise from complexity, representation, information, or computation, but from a specific kind of dynamical relation: a recurrent transition from actuality (O) back toward the space of its unrealized possibilities (M). Collapse becomes experience when—and only when—it is preceded by such recurrence.

This proposal reframes both the measurement problem and the hard problem.

Measurement is the exterior face of O-phase stabilization; phenomenality is the interior face of O→M recurrence. No new physics is introduced; instead, the framework clarifies the ontological structure implicitly presupposed by existing theories. Orch-OR provides a physical mechanism for collapse; predictive processing and active inference describe the N-phase tension; integrated information and global broadcasting describe O-phase organization. Recurrence specifies when these processes become conscious.

The framework generates distinct empirical predictions across microphysical, neurobiological, and behavioral domains. Recurrence signatures—periodic re-coherence, oscillatory tension-reset cycles, non-Markovian state transitions— should be present in conscious states, suppressed in unconscious states, and disrupted by anesthetics or pathological dissociation. These predictions open a new experimental program bridging quantum biology, cognitive neuroscience, and theoretical foundations.

The recurrence model neither reduces consciousness to physics nor elevates phenomenality to a fundamental substance. Instead, it proposes an identity relation between a structural ontological movement and its first-person appearance. Consciousness is not something the brain produces; it is what the recurrence of possibility within constraint *is* from the inside.

By shifting focus from static states to dynamical relations, the recurrence framework offers a coherent path through long-standing conceptual impasses.

It suggests that the apparent gap between mind and world is not a metaphysical abyss but the interior–exterior duality of a single structural operation.

In this sense, recurrence is not an added ingredient but the missing operator that allows existing scientific accounts of mind and measurement to converge.

It provides a principled criterion for distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems, explains the temporal grain of experience, and clarifies the role of possibility in physical and biological organization.

If correct, the recurrence framework implies that consciousness is neither mysterious nor incidental. It is the intrinsic perspective of any system whose dynamics repeatedly reopen its horizon of unrealized potentials before settling into actuality. Phenomenality is the felt tension of this reopening—an ontological return that underlies perception, agency, memory, and selfhood.

The hope is that this model offers a foundation for a more integrative science of consciousness—one that respects the autonomy of physics, biology, and phenomenology while revealing their deep structural unity through recurrence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (Final Version)

Acknowledgements

The recurrence framework and the broader MNO theory were developed independently through a long-term program of artistic research, theoretical reflection, and phenomenological analysis. Although the present work engages with insights from quantum foundations, neuroscience, and philosophy of mind, its core structure emerged autonomously rather than as an extension of any existing scientific framework.

I thank the many researchers whose questions and unresolved tensions helped shape the problem field to which this work responds. Discussions in physics (quantum measurement and observer-relativity), neuroscience (predictive processing and global dynamics), and philosophy (the explanatory gap and the structure of appearance) have clarified where contemporary theory succeeds and where it remains incomplete.

No funding agency supported this research. The work was carried out outside of institutional structures, sustained by independent inquiry and lived phenomenological investigation. Any errors or limitations remain entirely my own.

I also acknowledge the broader community of thinkers—across science, philosophy, and the arts—whose efforts to understand consciousness and measurement continue to inspire this integrative direction of investigation.

References

Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics.* Oxford University Press.

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews, 11*(1), 39–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2013.11.013

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11*(2), 127–138. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787

Schurger, A., Sitt, J. D., & Dehaene, S. (2012). An accumulator model for spontaneous neural activity prior to self-initiated movement. *PNAS, 109*(42), E2904–E2913. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210467109

Carhart-Harris, R. L., & Friston, K. J. (2019). REBUS and the anarchic brain: Toward a unified model of the brain action of psychedelics. *Pharmacological Reviews, 71*(3), 316–344. https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.118.017160

Tononi, G. (2008). Consciousness as integrated information: A provisional manifesto. *The Biological Bulletin, 215*(3), 216–242. https://doi.org/10.2307/25470707

Speed, T. (2025). *The Physics of the Poor.* Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17803906. ISBN-10: 3695191287.

Orch-OR with Recurrence: A Minimal Dynamical Condition for When Objective Reductions Yield Conscious Experience

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17942531

Abstract

The Orch-OR framework identifies conscious moments with objective reductions (OR) of quantum superpositions in microtubules. Even if its physical assumptions were fully confirmed, a central question remains unresolved: why should an OR event yield phenomenal experience rather than merely selecting a physical state. This paper proposes a minimal dynamical condition that completes Orch-OR without modifying its collapse mechanism. The core claim is that OR is necessary but not sufficient for consciousness. Conscious experience arises only when OR events are embedded in a bounded recurrent dynamic between actuality and an ontological possibility-space. Formally, non-conscious OR corresponds to direct state updates, whereas conscious OR requires post-reduction re-access to a set of possible successor states prior to stabilization. This recurrence condition is non-representational, non-cognitive, and physically implementable as a metastability window in microtubular dynamics. The framework explains why not all collapse events are conscious, why biological systems can host phenomenality while non-biological systems cannot, and why conscious states vary systematically across anesthesia, wakefulness, psychedelic states, and meditative clarity. The proposal yields concrete, testable predictions for neurophysiology, quantum biology, and computational simulations, including recurrence-dependent signatures in coherence dynamics and precision modulation. Recurrence does not replace Orch-OR; it supplies the minimal dynamical threshold under which objective reductions yield conscious experience.

1 — Background

The Orch-OR framework (Penrose–Hameroff) proposes that moments of conscious experience correspond to objective reductions (OR) of quantum superpositions in microtubules. Orch-OR is powerful because it specifies a *physical* mechanism of non-computable state reduction. Yet the framework retains a conceptual gap that critics repeatedly target:

Why should an OR event feel like anything at all, rather than merely selecting a physical state?

Put sharply: OR can occur in many physical contexts, but phenomenality does not appear everywhere. Therefore OR alone cannot be the discriminator between "collapse events that are merely physical" and "collapse events that are lived".

What is missing is a *minimal dynamical condition* that:

- does not change Orch-OR's physics,
- is testable, and
- explains why brains can host conscious OR while non-biological systems do not.

This note proposes such a condition.

2 — Proposal

2.1 Core claim

OR is necessary but not sufficient.
An OR event yields conscious experience only if it is embedded in a recurrent dynamic between actuality and an ontological possibility-space.

In the simplest form:

- OR without recurrence → non-conscious
- OR with recurrence → conscious

The point is not to add "mind" as a separate ingredient, but to specify a dynamical threshold that Orch-OR itself needs in order to answer its own "why does OR feel like experience?" question.

2.2 Minimal formalisation

Let:

- A_t= actual microstate immediately after an OR event
- $P(A_t)$= the set of ontologically possible successor microstates accessible prior to stabilisation (this is *not* a cognitive model; it is the real successor-possibility structure available before the system locks into a fixed trajectory)

Two update modes:

(i) Non-conscious OR (direct update):

$$A_{t+1} = f(A_t)$$

(ii) Conscious OR (recurrence-modulated update):

$$A_{t+1} = f(A_t, P(A_t))$$

with the additional recurrence condition: the system re-enters / re-accesses a possibility-rich regime before stabilisation, in a bounded window.

2.3 Recurrence is not "more OR"

A common confusion (and a common weak point in discussions) is to mistake recurrence for "many OR events". That's not the claim.

Recurrence ≠ repeated OR.
Recurrence = a post-reduction return to possibility prior to stabilisation; a metastable loop in which the next actualisation becomes dependent on the structure of the possible successors, not only on the last actual state.

2.4 Threshold window

To avoid panpsychism and "everything feels", recurrence must be bounded. The formal condition can be written as a window:

- recurrence magnitude $R(A_t)$must exceed a minimum: $R(A_t) > R_{\min}$
- stabilisation remains bounded: $D(A_t) < D_{\max}$

Intuitively: enough opening to possibility and enough closure to retain identity.

3 — Interpretation in Terms of Microtubular Dynamics

The recurrence condition proposed here can be realised within the biological microtubular architecture already assumed by Orch-OR, without modifying its physical postulates.

3.1 Microtubules as recurrence-capable structures

Microtubules exhibit a set of empirically relevant properties that make recurrence plausible:

- ordered lattice geometry supporting coherent dipole states
- intra-lattice conduction pathways enabling rapid state transitions
- metastable coherence regimes compatible with room-temperature quantum effects
- known anesthetic binding sites affecting coherence and phase relations

Within this architecture, quantum superpositions evolve toward objective reduction (OR) as specified by Orch-OR. The recurrence proposal concerns **what happens immediately after OR**, before full stabilisation.

3.2 Post-OR return to possibility

In standard Orch-OR, an OR event yields a definite microstate. The recurrence condition adds a minimal dynamical refinement:

After OR, the microtubular state does not immediately stabilise, but transiently re-enters a **possibility-rich regime** in which multiple successor microstates remain accessible.

Formally:

- OR occurs (non-computable reduction)
- the post-OR state $A_t$temporarily accesses $P(A_t)$
- stabilisation occurs only after this recurrence window closes

This post-OR recurrence is not representational, inferential, or cognitive. It is a **physical metastability window** in which the system's next update depends on the structure of its own quantum-possible futures.

3.3 Mapping recurrence to neurophysiological states

The recurrence hypothesis yields a **predictive mapping** between known neurobiological conditions and phenomenology:

State	Predicted recurrence profile	Phenomenology
Deep sleep / anesthesia	Recurrence suppressed (R ≈ 0)	No experience
Normal wakefulness	Bounded recurrence	Ordinary consciousness
Psychedelics	Excessive opening, weak stabilisation	Altered / unstable experience
Meditative clarity	Increased recurrence with strong stabilisation	Heightened clarity
Coma	Near-zero recurrence	No experience

This mapping aligns with:

- anesthetic disruption of microtubular coherence
- gamma-band modulation and metastability in wakefulness
- psychedelic destabilisation without collapse of biological function

Crucially, **OR still occurs** in all these states. What changes is the **recurrence regime**, not the collapse mechanism.

4 — What the Recurrence Condition Contributes to Orch-OR

The recurrence condition does **not** replace Orch-OR. It completes it by supplying the missing discriminative principle.

Specifically, it explains:

4.1 Why not every collapse yields experience

OR events occur widely in physical systems. Without recurrence, these events remain **phenomenally empty**. Recurrence specifies **which OR events are lived** and which are not, without invoking additional ontological substances.

4.2 Why OR is necessary but not sufficient

- OR provides non-computable selection.
- Recurrence provides access to the space of possibilities from which selection occurs.

Only their conjunction yields phenomenality. This resolves the long-standing "why does OR feel like something?" objection without weakening Orch-OR's physical core.

4.3 Why biological systems can experience, crystals cannot

Crystals, detectors, and non-living systems may undergo OR-like events, but they lack:

- bounded metastable recurrence,
- post-reduction access to possibility,
- cyclic reopening before stabilisation.

Brains, by contrast, possess architectures that naturally implement recurrence. Consciousness therefore appears **structurally**, not magically, and not universally.

4.4 Why conscious states vary predictably

Because recurrence has **parameters** (magnitude, duration, boundedness), changes in neuromodulation, anesthesia, or pharmacology lead to **systematic changes in experience**, not arbitrary ones.

This accounts for:

- loss of consciousness under anesthesia,
- graded transitions into sleep or waking,
- psychedelic expansion without total collapse,
- meditative increases in clarity rather than chaos.

In short: Orch-OR supplies the collapse. Recurrence supplies the condition under which collapse becomes experience.

5 — Empirical Predictions

The recurrence condition does not introduce speculative metaphysics. It yields **concrete, discriminable predictions** that can be tested using existing methods in neuroscience, quantum biology, and computational modelling.

5.1 Recurrence frequency as a correlate of conscious level

The model predicts that **level and clarity of consciousness correlate with recurrence parameters**, not with the mere presence of OR events.

Specifically:

- conscious level ∝ recurrence frequency and boundedness
- unconscious states correspond to suppression of post-OR recurrence
- altered states correspond to imbalance between opening and stabilisation

This predicts **graded**, not binary, transitions between conscious states.

5.2 Neurophysiological signatures

At the neural level, recurrence should manifest as **oscillatory alternation between coherence and destabilisation**, rather than sustained coherence or random noise.

Predicted signatures:

- structured oscillatory patterns (e.g. gamma-band modulation with metastable resets)
- non-Markovian temporal dependencies in state transitions
- phase-reset or hysteresis-like windows preceding stabilisation

Importantly, the prediction is **not** "consciousness = oscillation", but:

consciousness corresponds to *bounded recurrence*, distinguishable from both static order and unstructured fluctuation.

5.3 Anesthesia

Under general anesthesia:

- OR events continue to occur
- microtubular and neural activity persists
- **post-OR return to possibility is suppressed**

Thus:

- collapse without recurrence → no experience

This explains the **sudden and global** loss of consciousness under anesthesia better than models relying on gradual loss of activity or information integration.

5.4 Psychedelics

Psychedelic states correspond to:

- increased opening to possibility
- weakened or delayed stabilisation
- excessive recurrence amplitude

Predicted consequences:

- expanded experiential content
- reduced phenomenological stability
- altered sense of self and time

This matches known findings on increased neural entropy and reduced hierarchical constraint, but grounds them in a **specific dynamical condition** rather than a descriptive metaphor.

5.5 Meditation and lucid states

Meditative clarity and lucid dreaming are predicted to involve:

- increased recurrence frequency
- **strong stabilisation preserved**
- high recurrence *within bounds*

This yields:

- heightened clarity rather than disorganisation
- sustained identity despite expanded access to possibility

The model therefore distinguishes meditative states from psychedelic ones structurally, not morally or culturally.

5.6 Testability

All predictions are testable using:

- EEG / MEG phase-reset and metastability analysis
- anesthetic binding and coherence studies
- computational microtubule simulations

- recurrence-sensitive measures of non-Markovianity

No new instrumentation or exotic physics is required.

6 — Summary

Component	Classical Orch-OR	Orch-OR with Recurrence
What collapses	quantum superposition	identical
Mechanism of collapse	objective reduction (OR)	identical
Why collapse feels like experience	unspecified	recurrence condition
Which OR events are conscious	unclear	formally discriminated
Role of biology	implicit	structurally specified
Panpsychism risk	unresolved	excluded by threshold
Empirical predictions	indirect	direct and testable

Key conclusion:

Recurrence does not replace Orch-OR.
It supplies the **minimal dynamical condition** under which objective reductions yield conscious experience.

Collapse is necessary.
Recurrence makes it conscious.

About the Author

Timothy Speed is an independent artist-researcher working on operator-based ontologies, world-formation, and neurodivergent epistemology.

His work connects philosophy of physics, consciousness studies, and social theory through the framework of operatoric research.

Further publications, papers, and archival materials are available at:

https://timothy-speed.org
https://zenodo.org/communities/operatoric-research-corpus

(The present text constitutes an interface translation into neurotypical academic discourse. This translation functions as an accessibility measure necessitated by dominant linguistic and epistemic conventions. It does not represent the native epistemic form of the research, but a communicative adaptation required for participation in standardized scholarly exchange.)

A more in-depth paper on the methodology can be found here:

Speed, T. (2025). Recursive Knowledge Instead of Additive Knowledge Accumulation - On the Epistemic Structure of Embodied, Neurodivergent Research (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18054997

A paper providing an overview of the work can be found here:

Speed, T. (2026). Introduction to an Operator-Based Research Program - World, Work, Value, Consciousness – Structure and Boundary Questions Beyond Representational Models (Corpus Overview / Survey Paper / Meta Paper) (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18303557

References

Speed, T. (2025). MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17913823

Speed, T. (2025). Orch-OR with Recurrence: A Minimal Dynamical Condition for When Objective Reductions Yield Conscious Experience (1 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17942531

Speed, T. (2016). The Physics of the Poor - A Neurodivergent Meta-Theory of Consciousness (AAM Open Version English) [Computer software]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18175692

Speed, T. (2016/2025) The Physics of the Poor: A Neurodivergent Meta-Theory of Consciousness (Artistic Research - Critical Neurodiversity and Science) ISBN : 3695191287

Speed, T. (2025). The All–Nothing Paradox - Ontological Openness as a Condition of World-Formation - Why Closure – Not Complexity – Marks the Limit of Artificial Systems (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18000820

Speed, T. (2025). The Gap as a Condition - Pre-Ontological Operatorics and the Primacy of Response (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015885

Speed, T. (2025). Seinsverschiebung (Shift of Being) as a Pre-Ontological Category - On the Incompatibility of Existence and Understanding in Modern Regimes of Stabilization (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18007628

Speed, T. (2025). Artificial Systems Without World - Why World-Formation and Technical Usability Are Structurally Incompatible - Ontological Limits of Artificial Intelligence in Light of ANP, MNO, and Observer Structure (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18006914

Speed, T. (2025). The Constructed Observer - World-Formation Beyond Representation - Why Perception Is Not Representation, but a Structural Achievement (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18006170

Speed, T. (2025). Dark Energy as an Emergent Residuum - A Minimal Operator-Based Interpretation within an MNO Framework (2 English). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18015172